Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-053
Tuesday
19 March 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-053 *19 March 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: As of 13 March 1991, Moscow domestic radio sourcelines in the DAILY REPORT will reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" designation in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new radio sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Diplomat Blames U.S. For Arms Treaty Delay *[TASS]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Meeting Ends: 'Changed' Stands Viewed *[Moscow International]* 2
CEMA States Disagree on Successor Body *[Budapest Radio]* 2
CSFR Economy Minister Views CEMA Session *[Prague Radio]* 2
Soviet Pullout, Transit Discussed With Poles *[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Churkin Reports Bessmertnykh-Genscher Meeting *[Radio Rossii]* 5
Gorbachev Meets With European Bank Chief *[PRAVDA 14 Mar]* 5
'Top Priority' Views Baker Soviet Visit *[Moscow International]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Baker Continues Visit, Mideast Views Assessed 9
U.S. Similarities, Differences Eyed *[TASS]* 9
Arms Treaty Delay Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 19 Mar]* 9
Palestinian Issue's Centrality Noted *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 10

Northeast Asia

Proposal for Two Islands Return to Japan Reported *[Tokyo KYODO]* 11
Japanese Premier Comments on Union Referendum *[TASS]* 11
Opposing Views in Japan on Soviet Relations *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 12
Academician Views ROK Economic Cooperation *[Moscow International]* 12

Near East & South Asia

Reports Continue on Postwar Mideast Crisis 13
Anti-Saddam Movement Assessed *[TRUD 13 Mar]* 13
Life in Baghdad Described *[Moscow TV]* 14
Peace Committee on U.S., Soviet Mideast Roles *[TASS]* 15
Israeli Communist Party Leader Visits Moscow *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 15

East Europe

Polish Foreign Minister Comments on Relations *[TASS]* 15
Pavlov, CSFR Official Hold News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 16 Mar]* 16

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Continues Moscow Visit 18 Mar 16
Gorbachev Talks Detailed *[PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 16
Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 18
Interviewed on Relations *[Moscow TV]* 19
Departs 18 Mar *[TASS]* 20
Commentary Assesses Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 21

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Session Resumes After Recess; Agenda Outlined *[TASS]* 22
Orlov Gives 'Preliminary' Referendum Figures *[TASS]* 22
Reports on Poll in Baltics, Moldova, Ossetia *[TASS]* 22
Lukyanov Interview on Democracy, Referendum *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 23

Political & Social

'Act of Terrorism' Disrupts Flight to Novosibirsk *[TASS]* 29
Reports Examine Internal Troops' Role, Situation 29
Political Chief Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Mar]* 29
Law, Order Roles Detailed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Mar]* 31
Ligachev Interviewed on Union's 'Disintegration' *[PRAVDA 11 Mar]* 31
Shevardnadze: Threat of Dictatorship Remains *[Milan L'UNITA 13 Mar]* 32
Zagladin on 'Explosion in Political Activity' *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Decree Banning Armed Formations Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 33
Journal Lists Dec-Feb Presidential Decrees *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 11]* 34

Economic

Gorbachev's Comments To Economists *[PRAVDA]* 35
Meeting Overview *[PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 38
Miners Strikes Continue Throughout the Country 42
Largest Strike in Soviet History *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Strike Spreads to Southern Urals *[TASS]* 42
Trade Union Requests Strike's End *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Hopes Dim for Vorkuta Miners *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 42
Kuzbass Deputies Begin Hunger Strike *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Donetsk Strike Update *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Rostov Miners Demand Double Pay *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Strike Affects Coking Furnaces *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Coalfield Unrest Considered *[PRAVDA 18 Mar]* 44
Shcherbakov on Market Transition *[TASS]* 45
Retail Prices Set To Rise 2 April *[Moscow TV]* 46
Price Increase Compensation Detailed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 11]* 46

Agricultural

Cabinet Examines Latest Farming Emergency *[IZVESTIYA 16 Mar]* 47

Scientific

Progress Burns Up in Atmosphere After Mission *[TASS]* 48
Space Officials Interviewed on Remote Surveys *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Aerospace Research Assistance Offered Abroad *[Moscow International]* 49

Military

Officials Attend Military CPSU Conferences 49
Shenin Addresses Moscow MD Party *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Mar]* 49
Baklanov Meets With Western Group *[PRAVDA 18 Mar]* 49

Luchinskiy Addresses Air Force *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Mar]* 49
Prokofyev Addresses Air Defense Forces *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 50
Stroyev Addresses Railroad Troops *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Mar]* 50
Air Force Chief of Staff on Gulf Lessons *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Mar]* 50
U.S., Soviet Treatment of Soldiers Contrasted *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 51
Armed Forces Group Protest Yeltsin's Appeal *[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Jan]* 52
Western Group Forces Sell Off Material Assets *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Mar]* 52
Baykonur Chief Describes Space Defense Systems *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Mar]* 53
Military Leaders Sign Official's Obituary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Mar]* 53

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

OMON Detains Lithuanian Defense Chief 54
Landsbergis Reports Arrest *[Radio Vilnius]* 54
Defense Chief Released *[Radio Vilnius]* 54
TASS Reports Detention 54
Butkevicius Discusses Arrest *[Radio Vilnius]* 55
Arrest Well-Planned 'Provocation' *[TASS]* 56
Landsbergis Views Yeltsin, Gorbachev, Army *[Vienna PROFIL 18 Mar]* 56
Latvian CP's Rubiks on 'Civil War' Risk *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 6 Mar]* 57
Burokevicius Views Lithuanian CP's Role *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Mar]* 59

RSFSR

Yeltsin Chairs 15 Mar Supreme Soviet Presidium *[Moscow TV]* 61
PRAVDA Cites Yeltsin Discrepancies on Issues *[16 Mar]* 62
PRAVDA Reprints BILD Yeltsin Interview *[18 Mar]* 62
RSFSR Presidium Accelerates Land Reform *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Khasbulatov Holds News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 63
Silayev Answers Questions on Current Issues *[Moscow TV]* 63
Polozkov Visits Arctic Military, Working Class 70
Interviewed by Northern Newspaper *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Mar]* 70
Addresses Northern Fleet Communists *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 70
Meets Murmansk Labor Collectives *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 70
Gidaspov at Leningrad Military Party Conference *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 71
IZVESTIYA Correction on Treaty Signatories *[15 Mar]* 71

Western Republics

Alleged Moldovan Human Rights Abuses Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Mar]* 71
Ukraine's Fokin Elected People's Deputy *[TASS]* 72
Ukrainian-Slovak Cooperation Agreement Signed *[Kiev International]* 72

Caucasus

Georgian Supreme Soviet Reorganizes State Bodies *[Moscow TV]* 72
Manayenkov Meets With Georgian Communists *[PRAVDA 16 Mar]* 72
Georgian Protest to North Ossetian Leader Cited *[PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 73
Interview With Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Reprinted *[PRAVDA 18 Mar]* 73
Turkish President Ozal Visits Baku 15-16 Mar 73
Welcomed on Arrival *[Baku Radio]* 73
Mutalibov, Gasanov on Ties *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 74
Talks Conclude, Documents Signed *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 74
Received by Mutalibov, Departs *[TASS]* 74
Turkish Military Plane Brings Medicine to Baku *[Baku Radio]* 75
Azerbaijan Counterintelligence Head on Espionage *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 75
Ter-Petrosyan Urges Debate on Ties With Turkey *[Yerevan International]* 75
Georgia Armenians Reject Prefect Appointment *[Yerevan International]* 76

Diplomat Blames U.S. For Arms Treaty Delay

LD1503164391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1511 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev, Igor Peskov, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Mar—A display of "political will" is the necessary condition for the rapid conclusion of work on the strategic offensive weapons treaty, a high-ranking Soviet diplomat believes. At the request of the TASS correspondents today, he described the current state of affairs at the talks on strategic offensive weapons.

In his opinion, the solution of the problem "is mainly in the hands of the Americans now, and as soon as they make the political decision to conclude the treaty, the work will proceed." At the same time, he pointed out the importance of mutual compromises without which the treaty cannot be concluded. "However," he added, "to speak frankly, we see no readiness on the part of the U.S. side to meet us halfway. Indeed, as the USSR foreign minister said yesterday, the treaty is virtually 98 percent prepared; some 2-3 percent is needed to resolve "technical questions." But at the final stage, the United States cited the war in the Persian Gulf or, as now, the postwar settlement, the diplomat noted.

Among the 2-3 percent of the unresolved questions, the diplomat named the problem of telemetry, which crops up throughout all the talks on strategic offensive weapons. "The point here is that both sides are agreed in principle on providing access to the other side to the telemetric information which is transmitted from ballistic missiles when they are launched. But the USSR and the United States each have a different practice for broadcasting such information. The essence of the matter is to arrive at a common denominator and not infringe either side," he said.

Another problem, the diplomat said, is connected with seeking ways of carrying out continuous observation (one of the forms of verification) of production plants (for producing strategic offensive weapons—TASS note). One other question exists connected with monitoring. Accords have been reached on inspection, but the problem has arisen of "scale criteria"—what to look at and what not to look at. Here, too, the sides have different practices.

According to the diplomat, much will depend on what proposals the U.S. delegation has brought with it to Moscow. However, he added, in any event, the talks cannot be concluded here: agreement can be reached in principle in Moscow, which will subsequently be translated into the language of an agrement in Geneva. "In my personal opinion," he said in conclusion, "if there is the political decision and subsequent intensive work by the sides over two to three weeks, success is 'physically and technically realistic.' But the more time that passes, the more 'underwater rocks' of various kinds appear."

CEMA Meeting Ends; 'Changed' Stands Viewed

LD1603150391 Moscow International Service in Hungarian 2000 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] The two-day meeting of the CEMA has ended in Moscow. Our correspondent reports on the outcome of the session:

Let me remind you that the session was held after the Budapest session scheduled for the end of February was postponed. This was necessary because the Hungarian Government had, in a letter to the Secretariat, informed it that a new situation had arisen in recent weeks in respect of the membership of the new international organization and the activity of this new body.

As Bela Kadar, Hungarian representative, explained at a news conference, the acceleration of market transformation processes and the modification of the (?external) economic policy of several CEMA member countries made it necessary that the debate should continue, but on the mechanisms of the future cooperation and its rational forms.

Professor Vyacheslav Sychev, secretary of the CEMA Council, says that he wants to mention that we find ourselves facing a completely new situation. Complex and tense work has been carried out by experts for a year, which ended with the full synchronization of the text of the founding document of the new organization. Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland have changed their stance.

Now, at the Moscow meeting, a frank, open, and confidential exchange of views took place. It is clear to everyone that the activity of the CEMA has ceased, but it is another question Professor Vyacheslav Sychev remarks, [whether] it will mean the forms and methods of a future multi-sided cooperation. For, after all, the CEMA countries are very closely linked to each other economically, and none of them has questioned this at the Moscow meeting.

We can hardly do without significant amendments in the already elaborated founding document. I cannot say what new proposals will be made; I simply do not know, Professor Sychev says. The international group of experts will continue the work at the start of April and, as it may be seen, written proposals will be submitted and many things will become clear at the April meeting of the permanent representatives, Professor Sychev concludes.

The changes which have taken place in every single member state do not exclude the (?possibility) of mutual cooperation. This was stated at the news conference by academician Stepan Sitaryan, Soviet permanent representative to CEMA. On the contrary, the changes set us the task of developing further these links, but on the basis of new principles; on the basis of market relations.

CEMA States Disagree on Successor Body

LD1503234391 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2000 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] The CEMA countries will continue their negotiations about the creation of a successor organization on an expert level in early April. After the working session in Moscow, Bela Kadar said that there was only an exchange of opinions and there was no intention of making a decision. [as heard]

It was stated at a news conference that officially CEMA cannot be dissolved because the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Romania, Vietnam, Cuba, and Mongolia would give their assent to this only if a successor organization is created. Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia do not oppose the establishment of a new economic organization, but hold the view that any new body cannot be the legal successor of the CEMA, and that its members can only be East European countries because its task would be, precisely, to fill the economic vacuum that has evolved in the region. These three countries do not wish to take on specific obligations. What they would like is for the new organization to be strictly of a consultative character.

CSFR Economy Minister Views CEMA Session

LD1503143791 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 1100 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] The extraordinary CEMA session ended in Moscow this morning. As is known, the session took place after the failure to hold a 46th CEMA session at the level of premiers in Budapest. Czechoslovakia was represented at the Moscow talks by Vladimir Dlouhy, minister of economy. Jan Smihula, our permanent correspondent in the USSR, interviewed him:

[Begin recording] [Smihula] Mr. Minister, was there anything extraordinary at this extraordinary session?

[Dlouhy, in Czech] Everyone has said it was an extraordinary session, but actually it was not so very extraordinary. The only special feature was that the individual speeches by the representatives of the relevant countries went deeper and wider this time and tried to define the basic problems facing us; that is, [word indistinct] ending of CEMA's activities and, second, whether to have a new organization and what it should be like. I could assess it in the following way: All countries, including Cuba, agree that CEMA's activities should end. The majority of the delegations—that is, our delegation, the Polish delegation, the Hungarian, and the Romanian—called for this to take place as soon as possible, without linking it to the establishment of a new organization. In other words, against an original document prepared for Budapest, the change that CEMA will be abolished relatively soon and that a new organization does not need to be set up immediately. At the same time, however, all delegations, including the Polish, the Czechoslovak, and the Hungarian, called for the establishment of a certain new organization, to deal with technical problems, problems

of ownership, and similar matters, and also—at the least—for consultations and the exchange of information. It will be an organization which as far as we are concerned, definitely will not have as large a staff as was the case until recently. In the previous document, we envisaged approximately eight people to represent us. It will be an organization which must be open. Some countries, including us, emphasize a certain regional character, which actually means a European character, for the organization, but think that it should be open to any other country too.

[Smihula] When we spoke together at the beginning of January, you said that the last parting session should be held at the end of February and beginning of March. We know that the session in Budapest did not take place last month. When will the last session be held, in your opinion?

[Dlouhy] I cannot say, nor has any other delegate proposed a date. It might however be that the experts will agree in two to three weeks on the final text of the document for ending CEMA's activities, and they could propose to the governments to authorize the relevant minister to sign the document ending CEMA's activities. It does not need to be the Council of Premiers. It could be another session, like the one which was held today, at which CEMA's activities will be ended. [end recording]

Soviet Pullout, Transit Discussed With Poles

PM1803145591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Union Edition p 7

[Interview with Colonel General Anatoliy Nikolayevich Kleymenov, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by correspondent V. Litovkin under the "Details for IZVESTIYA" rubric; place and date not given: "Our Trains Will Cross Poland"]

[Text] A Soviet military delegation headed by Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, paid a working visit to the Republic of Poland 11-12 March. The Soviet generals and officers met with the country's leadership and discussed acute problems associated with the troop withdrawal.

Colonel Gen. A. Kleymenov, deputy chief of the General Staff and a member of the Soviet delegation, answers our military correspondent's questions:

[Litovkin] Anatoliy Nikolayevich, the subject of your talks is no secret—it was the withdrawal of our troops from Poland and the transit of troops of the Western Group across its territory. On what did you manage to agree?

[Kleymenov] It is still too early to speak of an accord. Negotiations are still proceeding. Their fifth round is planned for 19-20 March. But it is possible to say the following about the last visit. Our delegation met with Polish Foreign Minister R. [initial as published] Skubiszewski; Vice Admiral P. Kolodziejczyk, minister of national defense of the Republic of Poland; Yu. [initial as published] Zabinski, administrator of the country's Council of Ministers; J. Merkel, minister for questions of national security; and other officials.

There was discussion—and you are right here—about the length of our troops' stay in Poland and about the creation of mutually acceptable conditions for the withdrawal of Soviet Army units and combined units from the FRG across the country's territory. There are many nuances here.

As you know, only recently the Polish side was categorically insisting on our troops' unconditional withdrawal from the country before the end of this year. And that demand was accompanied by large-scale demonstrations, rallies, and political actions which, of course, caused definite harm to our relations and left their mark on interstate and military ties.

We understand the Poles' feelings, but the deadlines laid down by them were not realistic from any viewpoint—political, economic, military, or even human. For the Northern Group of Forces means not only combat hardware and material resources but, above all, people. Officers, ensigns, their wives and children. We simply do not have the moral right to disregard their vital interests.

It is gratifying that during the talks our interlocutors were able to understand our concern, and we succeeded in eliminating the acuteness of this problem.

The chief thing on which we agreed was that the start of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Polish territory will signify the opening of the country's borders for combined units and units of the Western Group to transit to the USSR. The specific time for the start and conclusion of this withdrawal will be decided at a meeting of our heads of state soon.

[Litovkin] That is, our troop withdrawal from Poland and the transit across the country are rigidly linked?

[Text] [Kleymenov] Yes, this will be a unified process.

[Litovkin] But the troop withdrawal from Germany is already proceeding by sea, by the "Mukran-Klaipeda" ferry crossing. Will the delay in it not affect the schedule agreed with the FRG Government?

[Kleymenov] No, it will not. We were intending to complete it by the end of 1994 and we will complete it on schedule, although certain amplifications and agreements are also possible. And the withdrawal of troops and hardware from Germany is being carried out today not only by ferry crossing. Vessels of the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet, transport ships of the Twice Red Banner Baltic Fleet, and military transport aircraft of the Air Force are involved in it. Shipments by sea will continue to be the main ones, but the railroad too is to facilitate this role.

We have agreed with the Polish side that several railroad trains will cross the country's territory every day toward the Soviet borders. Chiefly with heavy combat hardware, military-technical property, and stocks of material means. I cannot give more specific figures at present—they are being defined more precisely in the talks process. But I wish to point out that movements of our troops by railroad transport are very advantageous for Poland, for their railroads carry a far from full load today...

We evidently will not use Poland's roads and highways for transit.

[Litovkin] Why? Are they very expensive?

[Kleymenov] Yes, this is rather costly for us. The Polish side has asked for more than $200 for every truck. You yourself can calculate what this will amount to if it is necessary to transfer tens of thousands of vehicles. But the economic aspect is not the chief thing.

It is necessary to take into account the complexity of organizing such a large-scale movement of vehicles. It entails providing hardware with fuels, lubricants, and spare parts, feeding those driving and accompanying the vehicles, organizing their daytime and nighttime rest, setting up the engine-tuning service, and many other questions. We also must not disregard the experience of servicemen-drivers, the ecological consequences, possible disruptions of the road network, other problems...

I want to emphasize—the talks are continuing. Of course there are complexities. And considerable ones. And yet I would point out that they are primarily constructive relations that are shaping up between our delegations. We are entering a new sphere of interstate and military ties, and there is a noticeable Polish desire to find common points of contact with us and to resolve on a mutually advantageous basis the problems that arise, while at the same time, of course, not forgoing one's own interests.

The following detail is also striking: Despite the difficulties that arise, the Polish leaders are seeking to preserve the friendly ties with us that are traditional for our countries and peoples. They must be broadened and strengthened under the new economic conditions and in the European security system that is being created. We support that desire.

Churkin Reports Bessmertnykh-Genscher Meeting

LD1803151691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] The second round of talks between the foreign ministers of the USSR and Germany, Bessmertnykh and Genscher, ended in Moscow today. According to Foreign Ministry spokesman Churkin, problems of arms limitations were discussed with the participation of experts, as well as several questions of relations between the two countries.

The German side also raised the question of, let's say, the stealthy departure of former GDR leader Erich Honecker, for the Soviet Union. It turned out that this happened back on 14 March. Honecker, who is 78 years old, was under investigation. Although the German side has demanded in quite energetic terms that Honecker be returned, German spokesmen themselves believe that Moscow will not do this.

The Honecker couple had been living recently in a military hospital of the Western Group of Forces in Beelitz, near Berlin. According to unconfirmed reports the couple left for Moscow from the military airport of Wuensdorf. This is where the command of the Western Group of Forces is based.

Incidentally, the attempts by some correspondents, including Soviet ones, to get on Honecker's trail so far have not been successful. Reliable and well-informed departments of the Defense Ministry in [words indistinct] special privileged clinics and hospitals give the same answer: We do not know anything.

It is interesting that even the head of the information directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry also said recently at a briefing in the press center that we do not currently know anything about where Honecker is, although we will not make a secret of it, Churkin added.

Some of the German media are coming out with the theory that the rescue of Honecker was a condition for the ratification of the German-Soviet treaties by the USSR Supreme Soviet, a condition set by the Soyuz group of deputies. But Deputy Alksnis, the leader of the group, has rejected such rumors in a conversation with the KOMMERSANT weekly.

Gorbachev Meets With European Bank Chief

PM1503162991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With J. Attali"]

[Text] A meeting took place 13 March in the Kremlin between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and J. Attali, president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The USSR President welcomed the establishment of this new international banking institution, cofounded by the Soviet Union. This is a great event in European development, he noted.

J. Attali expressed the bank's readiness to assist the implementation of the ongoing sweeping reforms in the USSR, stressing that the whole world is deeply interested in their success. The ability of the Soviet Union and its leadership to profoundly renew the country cannot be doubted, he stated. Naturally, such renewal requires political stability. The forthcoming 17 March referendum will create the necessary preconditions for continuing the reforms.

M.S. Gorbachev again stressed the unshakable desire to continue and accelerate the planned transformations. If we sometimes have to resort to utilizing administrative methods, he noted, it is only in order to keep the situation in hand. Because if we did not manage to do this we would have to stop the reforms. But we have no intention of stopping. On the contrary, new steps forward are on the agenda which are associated with putting further transformations on a more solid legal footing simultaneously with their practical implementation, specifically in the plan for stabilizing the financial sphere and strengthening the ruble. This will then enable us to proceed to convertibility of the ruble, which will create a new foundation for cooperation with the outside world.

During the talk, economic and political aspects of cooperation between the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Soviet Union were discussed. Spheres of possible collaboration singled out included the power industry, infrastructure improvements, conversion, and assistance in de-statization and privatization and the establishment of a new credit and finance institution in the USSR—a bank for development and project financing. It was agreed to get down to taking practical steps along these and other lines without wasting time.

We view the development of collaboration in all these directions, M.S. Gorbachev noted, in the context of building a greater Europe stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals, which will undoubtedly help to comprehensively expand the potential of our continent as a whole. J. Attali stated that he fully shares this approach.

Participating in the talk were J.-P. Fitussi [name as transliterated] and M. von Bismarck-Osten, leading staffers from the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and on the Soviet side V.V. Gerashchenko, S.A. Sitaryan, E.Ye. Obminskiy, V.B. Zagladin, and O.I. Ozherelyev.

'Top Priority' Views Baker Soviet Visit

LD1603113891 Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 15 Mar 91

["Top Priority" hosted by Irina Tkachenko, with Andrey Kortunov of the Institute for United States and Canada Studies, and Jonathan Sanders, CBS Moscow Bureau]

[Text] [Tkachenko] Welcome to Top Priority. I am Irina Tkchenko and here in the studios of Radio Moscow we have Andrey Kortunov of the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies here in Moscow, and Jonathan Sanders of the CBS Moscow Bureau.

The U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's visit to Moscow is shortened somewhat to two days and, timed to coincide with President Bush's tour abroad, is intended to help shape primarily the postwar security arrangement in the Persian Gulf. It comes amid wide speculation over the future role of the Soviet Union and the United States in the region, and neither of the two sides seem to have a very clear-cut idea of what their exact position and what their exact weight, let's say, in the region is going to be. How feasible does the U.S. plan, the U.S. peace plan which James Baker has brought with him to Moscow, look to you? Andrey?

[Kortunov] Well, I think that basically now we have only the blueprint of the peace plan, and I think that up to now the U.S. position on the postwar political settlement in the Gulf was rather cautious and, I would say rather wise. They didn't try to press Iraq even further, they were able to preserve, at least try to preserve Iraq as a viable political and economic power in the Gulf, and I think that we are moving to some Soviet-U.S. understanding on these specific issues.

[Tkachenko] Jonathan, why do you think the United States has been so cautious in pressing for the immediate removal of Saddam Husayn, although clearly the U.S. Administration has voiced its dissatisfaction with Saddam staying in power?

[Sanders] Well, I think that there's a problem of how they proceed. That is, on the face of it, they have to say the same thing that the Soviet Union says—that we don't interfere in the domestic affairs of sovereign nations. They also have to say that we don't assassinate leaders. While they're saying all of this, I am sure that the CIA is not playing an innocent role. History teaches us that when there are these kinds of spontaneous revolts, that somewhere, somewhere, somebody's got a little money, or a weapon or two, or something. And in fact it would be that the KGB and the CIA are working on this together. The problem, of course, is who is going to replace him, and the worst thing for stability in the region would be if someone even crazier than Huasayn came in. They don't know quite what's next, and so they have been proceeding very cautiously. In much of this U.S. policy has been too cautious; after all, it was the failures of intelligence, the failure of the State Department to deal and to warn Iraq sufficiently before 2d August that may have allowed, may have given a false impression the U.S. would do nothing, that gave them a go-ahead sign, or let the Iraqis think they could just march into Kuwait. So it's not that we're following a brilliant trail of diplomatic insight and maneuvering; the insight has been after the fact and has been at the United Nations, not in bilateral relations, certainly not with Iraq.

[Tkachenko] Singling out the KGB and the CIA so explicitly sounds a little bit vicious to me.

[Sanders] Well, sometimes truth is vicious, but you know, when there were revolts in Nicaragua, in El Salvador, when there's been counter-revolution in Grenada, there's been revolution in Grenada, then there's been an invasion of Grenada. We know all those things happen, and how about the invitation for the Soviet troops just to come into Afghanistan; that just happened spontaneously. We can't be so naive.

[Kortunov] You know, I think there's a problem with the opposition Iraqis, that now it is split at least into three major segments. One of the major political forces of the opposition is oriented toward the countries of the Gulf, and at least two of the three forces are not necessarily pro-American, and the other problem is that all of them are too weak to control the situation in the whole country. And if there is what I can call Lebanization of Iraq, which seems possible, it will be very frustrating, and it will be a great destabilizing factor for the whole region. For example, if Kurds want to have their own state on the territory of northern Iraq, of course it will destabilize the southern regions of Turkey, it will destabilize the Turkish regions of Iran, and will have a major factor of chronical instability in the Middle East, which nobody wants.

[Tkachenko] Most of the power struggle in the region depends certainly on arms supplies and the West, for example, expressing repeatedly its concerns over the prospects of resupplies of weapons to Iraq later by the Soviet Union. How groundless, or how grounded, are these fears to you, Andrey?

[Kortunov] Well, first of all, I think that the Soviet Union will be more cautious in supplying arms to countries like Iraq. Second, I don't think that they'll have money to pay for the armaments that they already got. In fact, it's an irony of history, but the bulk of the Iraqi armaments supplied by the Soviet Union was paid for by Kuwait and the countries of the Gulf, so they were hit by the armaments that they acquired themselves. And, finally, you know, speaking of the Soviet Union, I think that the Arab states will be less willing to buy Soviet armaments because, you know, many people consider this conflict as a competition, as a test, of Soviet and U.S. weapons. And the Soviet weapons turned out not to be very effective, though you know our General Staff makes the point that it's not the weapons that were tested, but the skills.

[Sanders] Except for one important exception—KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, RED STAR, newspaper this week.

[Tkachenko] It seems to be your favourite.

[Sanders] Oh, I read it every day; had an article about the failure of anti-aircraft weaponry and how much the new Stealth weapons were able to evade any kind of Soviet radar or anti-aircraft defenses, and that's a serious problem, not only for those countries who obviously

think they are going to fight the United States again; they'd be throwing their money out to buy Soviet anti-aircraft defenses. That's a problem for the Soviet Union's sense of security too, and those weapons did an incredible job. The Soviet Union probably won't be selling a lot of weapons to that part of the world, but most Third World countries that buy weapons don't buy them to fight the United States; they buy them to fight each other, and T-72 tanks are real good at that. And as we saw in Lithuania, T-72 tanks are great at crushing civilians, and so on. Third World countries want to buy weapons to keep their own populations down; they are still going to buy Soviet weapons.

[Tkachenko] From weapons in the Middle East to weapons (?closest to Moscow). Here in Europe, the START and the CFE [Conventional Forces in Europe] talks seem to be stalling; could James Baker's visit give a new impetus to these talks, and what is the basic problem, to your mind?

[Kortunov] Well, you know, from my point of view, the Baker's visit can show to Gorbachev quite explicitly what is at stake right now, because by allowing military to cheat with some, you know, redeployments of certain units and new attachments of the units, Gorbachev, whether he knew it or not, but he challenged the whole process of European detente. And now the whole issue of European, all-European home, is under question. So I'm not sure that this problem can be resolved just within one visit of the state secretary, but I think that at least now it should be absolutely clear for people in Moscow that if they allow their military to go too far, they can undermine almost everything they achieved in the last five years in international politics.

[Sanders] I think, I think Andrey is exactly right. But I do think that at least on the CFE talks, that since Prime Minister Major was here and raised that very same issue, raised the way the military's been cheating by reclassifying divisions as amphibious and putting them behind the Urals, and since it's a question of definition and a policy question, not a technical question, that that is the kind of thing that Baker could again hammer home and bring out and they could find some way out. It's not a top issue to resolve. The START talks, however, as I understand—I am no expert on the intricacies of that kind of weaponry—are bogged down in very technical details that take a long time to iron out. And the worst thing with that is to rush through, 'cause that's when you really get into problems. So on one of the negotiations, it's conceivable they could make progress, because it's a political policy issue; on the other, I don't think Baker's even going to touch it himself, other than to say, let's get our experts together and sit down in a room and accelerate these talks.

[Kortunov] Well, you know, I think that the only thing they can really do in the area of the START negotiations is that by setting the deadline for the summit, they can somehow accelerate the process of negotiations in Geneva, because diplomats will have a kind of deadline; otherwise they can, you know, have these negotaitons for ever, because it's a huge volume, more than 500 pages, and they have lots of protocols, lots of data, lots of clarification, and they can go for decades without getting to an agreement.

[Sanders] And they need a little shturmovshchina [previous word in Russian], a little storming impulse, I think, to get it done. I certainly think that the problem with the CFE talks gives fuel to the U.S. right wing, which again is saying we can't trust Gorbachev, he's got blood on his hands because of the Baltics, he tried to interfere in our war in Iraq; you know the sentiment, even among decent right-thinking Americans, moderate Democrats, was basically—Soviet Union butted out, we're doing okay on our own—when they were fighting in Iraq. I think that this is that kind of issue which buttresses all the American anti-Sovietists, all the American cold warriors, and it's one that, it maybe of course that the right-wing here likes too.

[Tkachenko] Talking on a more domestic level, the meeting with the leaders of constituent Soviet republics, was that a sign that Washington administration is trying to open the door wider for cooperation with what is called the opposition here in the Soviet Union? So far, much of the attention has been focused on President Gorbachev and the central authorities; do you see that as a change in the political stand in [sentence incomplete]

[Sanders] Well, I think it's a very clear indication that those people who have been indicating there has to be a two-track policy towards the Soviet Union, that Gorbachev may be slipping, people like Mr. Gates at the National Security Council, or want to see an approach directly to the republics. I think it's also a way of taking some of the pressure off the Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Ukrainian pressure groups in the United States, and I think it's a way of people saying, oh, well Gorbachev's entering his seventh year; people have the seven-year itch. We can't pin all our policies on Gorbachev always being there; we've got to have some other bets laid down. I also think it's an indication that they don't really know what to do 'cause things are so confused here.

[Tkachenko] Andrey, do you think that, let's say all the democratic forces, the democratic parts of the central government, President Gorbachev himself, and the republican leadership, could gain from this meeting, from this change in the U.S. stand, possibly in trying to see sense in unification rather than in bickering over the details in their positions?

[Kortunov] Well, it depends how you define democratic forces, because they are split among themselves, and we have different factions competing with each other, and I think they will seek recognition from outside in order to cement their position at home. But speaking of Gorbachev, I think it can push him a little bit in terms of his foreign policy, because until recently his foreign policy was unquestionable asset. Now it seems to be a little of

liability also, and I think that when our, when and if, our republican leaders try to challenge him in the domain of foreign policy, he can be able to change some accents, maybe to clarify some of his statements, and maybe he can be more down to earth, he may be more pragmatic, more rational, less messianic, less (?globalistic) oriented, and from this point of view I think it is positive, it is an important balance to this old-style new thinking, if I may put it (?that way).

[Sanders] But what their old-style new thinking needs most of all is some kind of an approach in foreign policy that is going to lead to more investments and more trade, and that's hard to see, especially hard to see given some of the inane things that his prime minister has said recently.

[Tkachenko] Could the democrats' clear opposition to the national referendum, to preserving the Union the way it is constructed today, be a problem for the West in offering the assistance that you are talking about?

[Sanders] I don't think that that's the real stumbling block to better economic relations. I think the chaos, what did Shmelev called it this week, economically we're living in an insane asylum. Trade is not increasing, there are less people interested in investing, the unreasonable prices being exacted from American companies to set up business here, the problems with trade, the fact that people who want to strike deals are being attacked for being speculators, for lack of incentives, the fact that the economy is probably going to decrease between 10 and 25 percent GNP [Gross National Product] in the next year. Those realities, rather than any election issues, are what is scaring off more economic contact with the West.

[Tkachenko] Andrey, do you think that the democrats, whoever they are, with all the wide spectrum of democratic opinion taken into account, will after the referendum on 17th March, be moving closer together, or will they perhaps be drifting further apart [word indistinct]?

[Kortunov] Well, I think that it depends primarily on what steps will be taken by the central government after the referendum. If the central government will try to (?screw) democrats, just claim that they have public mandate to implement their own political and economic agenda and to fight down all the opposition, then it would be natural for the opposition to unite its forces against the central government, and in this case we can, probably we can see a new coalition of forces, because democrats will feel the real danger to their positions and they will try to unite their forces. But if the central government is wise enough not to push this issue too hard and Gorbachev tries to split democratic movement, to find some people in the democratic movement who can support him, at least partially, and he is very keen in, you know, dividing his political opponents, then I can foresee further disarray in the ranks of the democratic movement here in this country.

[Tkachenko] Well, on that let me end this edition of Top Priority and say thank you very much to Jonathan Sanders of CBS News here in Moscow and Andrey Kortunov of the U.S. and Canadian Studies Institute. I am Irina Tkachenko; till next week, goodbye.

United States & Canada

Baker Continues Visit, Mideast Views Assessed

U.S. Similarities, Differences Eyed

LD1803185991 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By TASS international news analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow March 18 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh had a regular meeting in the Soviet capital recently. Baker was received by President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Although the results of the talks cannot be referred to as epoch-making, nevertheless they proved quite useful, which was recognised by the two sides which reaffirmed their resolve to continue to develop their relations. This alone, it seems, made the U.S. secretary of state's visit to Moscow worthwhile, since it is no secret that the climate of world politics depends in many respects on how Soviet-U.S. relations fare.

Noteworthy among important points of accord was considerable similarity of views on a number of regional issues, specifically on the problem of Afghanistan, the Middle East, and a Gulf security system. Similar basic approaches were revealed, which, it is not ruled out, may lead to joint actions as well.

Moreover, there was mutual understanding over El Salvador, which resulted in a joint Soviet-U.S. statement published in the press.

Progress in the sphere of bilateral relations was also tangible. It was not fortuitous that Baker, when summing up the results of the talks in Moscow, emphasised that relations between the two countries remained good.

All this does not mean, of course, that there were no differences in the attitudes of the sides. There were differences over the disarmament issue, in particular, which, in its turn, affects a decision on the date of a new Soviet-U.S. summit.

The existence of differences is quite a natural thing. One could hardly expect anything different, considering that Soviet-U.S. partnership which followed years-long confrontation, is virtually only beginning now.

It is another matter that the two sides need to reckon with the opinion of each other and seek to adapt to it, and not demand unilateral concessions from each other. This, in my view, would not simply be errouneous but would also contradict the logic of the established politicial dialogue.

Moreover, it seems to me, that it is essential for the two sides to mutually take domestic problems into account. The Soviet Union has now entered a period of political and economic difficulties which gave an impetus to nationalist and separatist sentiments.

Disappointing in this connection is the double standard of Washington's position as regards the territorial integrity of countries.

U.S. President George Bush, during his recent visit to Canada, actively advocated the unity of the Canadian federation. At the same time, not a single member of the U.S. Administration, the U.S. secretary of state including, publicly made similar pronouncements in application to the Soviet Union, apart from numerous statements of support for the policy of perestroyka.

I am convinced that it would hardly be beneficial for the United States to seek a break-up of the Soviet federation, since such a disintegration is fraught with unpredictably serious and lasting negative consequences and destabilisation of international relations.

Arms Treaty Delay Viewed

PM1803195191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent A. Shalnev: "Why Is Signing of Treaty Being Delayed? James Baker's Statement After Moscow Visit"]

[Text] New York—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker has admitted that it is not Moscow but Washington that is blocking the conclusion of the treaty on strategic offensive arms. The treaty should have been signed as long ago as last December, but there is still a big question mark over the timing of its signing.

The following question was put to Baker, who was appearing in Sunday's ABC-TV program "This Week with David Brinkley": "As much as one year ago it was being said that the strategic arms treaty had almost been elaborated and that just a few technical details were outstanding. Are you prepared to conclude that the Soviet military are simply trying to stop what the politicians would like to advance?"

"We do have such a concern," said the secretary of state, who has just returned from a lengthy foreign tour, including a visit to the Soviet Union, "but it is with regard to the agreement on conventional types of arms (signed in Paris last November—A.Sh.). This in turn is holding up progress in the strategic arms sphere. It is not so much a matter of the strategic arms treaty as of the interpretation of the differences that we have with regard to the accord on conventional arms. It will be difficult to conclude the strategic offensive arms treaty until we have investigated these differences. Incidentally, just two questions remain there."

What James Baker deemed it possible to declare in public confirms the speculation in the U.S. press, from which it follows that Washington has noticeably lost interest in the fate of the accords on strategic offensive arms which are almost ready but which have still not

been completely elaborated. As the commentators Evans and Novak pointed out recently: "Having won the war in the Persian Gulf, President Bush has made it known to his advisers that the strategic offensive arms treaty is no longer the sacred political and military symbol of ensuring security that it once was. The President has even ventured to discourse out loud about the 'unipolar' world in which nothing threatens U.S. might, since it has no equals, and in which arms control and even summit meetings are no longer absolutely necessary."

Incidentally, this was also manifested in the support which the quite recent initiative of Senator John Warner, who is seeking a revision of the 1972 Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty, has received from the White House and, in particular, from Brent Scowcroft, the President's assistant for national security affairs. The purpose of the senator's initiative, which has at present come to a halt but, it seems to me, will still be continued, boils down to lifting the restrictions on the development and testing of new ABM systems, including the "Star Wars" system.

Returning to Baker's television appearance, it must be pointed out that, as the secretary of state emphasized, he does not yet intend to recommend to the President that the Paris agreement be submitted to the Senate for ratification. Reporting that the Soviet side had made some proposals at the talks in Moscow and "gone in our direction," Baker said: "But this is not enough." From the viewpoint of the secretary of state, the disagreements between Moscow and Washington over the Paris agreement can be accounted for, in particular, by the position of the military in the USSR.

Baker also spoke of "the debate underway in the Soviet Union over the question of the reforms and the changes in a society which for 70 years followed the same political and economic course and which has now totally changed course and is moving in a different direction. Of course, this creates serious tension."

Concerning the relationship between the republics and the center, Baker pointed out that "the nationwide referendum in the Soviet Union will not solve the problem. The fundamental problem will remain: How do the republics correlate with the center, how to ensure the transfer of political and economic power to the republics, how to transform the command economy?"

It follows from Baker's statements that Washington's position on this question will vary depending on which republic it is talking about.

"There is a difference between the Baltic republics and the other republics. We will not allow," the secretary of state emphasized, "the use of force to crush peaceful dissidence and peaceful political self-expression. As for the Baltic republics, this is our position: They must be free to realize their hopes and aspirations. Since 1933 the United States has recognized the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union—with the exception of the Baltic states."

The head of the foreign policy department rejected suggestions that Washington might raise the question of the Baltic republics at the United Nations. We are now trying to secure practical steps which will enable the Balts to see their hopes and aspirations realized. We are pushing (Moscow) to set up a mechanism of talks for the peaceful solution of the problems.

One noteworthy moment in the television interview, to my mind, was when George Will, one of the program's presenters, accusing Moscow of "lies and deception," put what evidently seemed to him a rhetorical question: "And that is the new thinking?"

"You must," Baker objected, "recognize this: Germany is reunited and remains in NATO's ranks and central and eastern Europe is free. All this because the Soviet Union enabled it to happen. Moreover, it would certainly have been impossible to sort out the situation in the Persian Gulf the way we were able to had the Soviet Union not supported us completely."

It followed from what the secretary of state said that in relation to the Near East Washington would regard the Soviet Union's restoration of full diplomatic relations with Israel as a development of this support. "If Moscow wants to play an effective and useful role in the region," Baker said, "it must do so. It has influence with Syria and with the Palestinians, but the trust that is essential for someone who intends to play a role there will come with the establishment of full relations with Israel."

According to the secretary of state, Moscow is seriously considering doing this but it has not yet arrived at the decision to do so.

Finally: Baker was asked about Tel Aviv's efforts to settle Soviet Jews in the occupied territories, particularly in the West Bank of the River Jordan. While recalling that Washington had actively sought to expand emigration from the USSR and stressing "great satisfaction that the USSR had allowed so many to leave," the secretary of state said he was categorically opposed to the creation of new settlements on occupied land. "It would be a de facto annexation," he stressed.

Palestinian Issue's Centrality Noted

PM1903121391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by correspondent V. Belyakov: "Subject That Will Not Go Away on Its Own. A Near East Settlement Is Impossible Without Resolving the Palestinian Problem"]

[Text] Cairo—U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's tour of the Near East last week had one notable characteristic. For the first time since the outbreak of the Persian Gulf crisis it was not only the situation in the region but also the Arab-Israeli conflict that came under discussion.

This subject is once again taking center stage in Near East politics. Postwar peace and stability cannot be

ensured in the Gulf region without ensuring peace and stability in the Near East as a whole, 'A. Bisharah, secretary general of the Gulf Cooperation Council, pointed out during a conversation with me last month in Riyadh, since our region is part of the Near East. In his opinion, a just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict—primarily its heart, the Palestinian problem—is necessary for this.

The current situation as regards a Near East settlement has a new and extremely important aspect: "The United States must apply the same principles which it applied during the Kuwaiti crisis to the resolution of the Palestinian problem," Cairo's AL-JUMHURIYAH noted, reflecting a widespread opinion in the Arab world. Many people here believe that the moment of truth has come for U.S. Near East policy. It is a question of testing Washington's claims that it wants to establish a "new just world order" to see if they are sincere.

What new things did J. Baker bring with him to the Near East? Nothing, effectively. Echoing President G. Bush's speech in Congress, he advocated implementing UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 based on the "land for peace" principle and recognizing the Palestinian people's political rights. This stance met with a positive response in Arab capitals, but was once again rejected by Israel. The secretary of state brought no concrete program to implement these resolutions, claiming that the "United States cannot impose peace." When Arab ministers advocated calling an international peace conference on the Near East under UN auspices as the most suitable instrument for a settlement, Baker failed to back them.

The first point on the memorandum which a Palestinian delegation from the occupied territories handed Baker during their meeting in Jerusalem was a demand not only for the occupation to be stopped but also for the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and the creation of an independent national state to be ensured. What the secretary of state said about the progress of his Near East tour, however, shows that the United States has no intention as yet of recognizing the Palestinian people. One wonders: How can there be a "just world order" then?

Many U.S. officials complain that there is no one with whom to hold talks on the fate of the Palestinian people: The PLO has discredited itself with its pro-Iraqi position. But these claims are no more than an excuse. Whatever position the PLO holds on other problems, that does not lessen the Palestinian people's legitimate rights. Certainly, they still consider this organization their only legitimate defender, both on the occupied territories and outside. That is clear from the Palestinians' aforementioned memorandum that was given to Baker in Jerusalem.

The now famous war in the Persian Gulf has in principle changed nothing in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Israel's occupation of the Arab territories and their deprivation of the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights have continued as before. Only when this comes to an end will it be possible to expect stable normalization and lasting peace in the Near East.

Northeast Asia

Proposal for Two Islands Return to Japan Reported

OW1803155391 Tokyo KYODO in English 1541 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, March 18 KYODO—The Soviet Foreign Ministry appears to have decided to return two of the four disputed Soviet-held islands off Hokkaido to Japan if Japan abandons its claim to two other islands, the independent news agency INTERFAX reported Monday.

The proposal came up while Moscow is discussing measures to improve relations between Japan and the Soviet Union prior to the visit to Tokyo by President Mikhail Gorbachev on April 16-19, the report said.

The return of the two islands—Shikotan and the Habomai group—is based on the 1956 joint declaration between the two countries, the report said. The two other islands involved in the territorial dispute are Iturup and Kunashir.

Gorbachev may propose the reversion of the two islands during his Japan visit, it said.

The report quoted Soviet defense officials as saying that Shikotan and the Habomais are not of military or strategic importance.

The four islands were taken by the Soviet Union immediately following the end of World War II.

The INTERFAX report followed early returns in the Soviet referendum in which the majority 70.2 percent of the voters on Kunashir, Shikotan, and Habomai Islands—opposed returning the islands to Japan.

Japanese Premier Comments on Union Referendum

LD1903073391 Moscow TASS in English 0718 GMT 19 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Bantin]

[Text] Tokyo March 19 TASS—The preliminary results of Sunday's referendum on the preservation of the Soviet Union show that "President Mikhail Gorbachev enjoys confidence", said the Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu during a meeting with reporters at the country's legislature today.

Stressing that "the policy of perestroyka pursued by the Soviet president is continuing", Kaifu expressed the opinion that "confidence won by Mikhail Gorbachev" as a result of the referendum is a positive factor "also for the Soviet president".

The KYODO TSUSHIN news agency notes that Kaifu said that the referendum's results "are conducive to the improvement of Japanese-Soviet relations".

Opposing Views in Japan on Soviet Relations

PM1903094591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 First Edition p 5

[Reprot by correspondent I. Latyshev: "Good Omen"]

[Text] Tokyo, March—The closer the date of USSR President Gorbachev's visit to Japan, the more attention Japanese politicians and the press are paying to this event, which is generally believed to be intended to open a new chapter in the history of Soviet-Japanese relations.

Two contradictory trends can quite definitely be traced in the discussions that unfolded last week in the country's ruling circles.

One of them reflects the views of the supporters of a "tough" approach to the Soviet Union. These views essentially boil down to the fact that during the upcoming high-level talks between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, the latter should display "firmness" and give an ultimatum to the distinguished Soviet guest concerning Japan's intention to extend economic and political contacts with the Soviet Union only if the Soviet side satisfies Japan's territorial claims without delay.

Side by side with such moods in the life of Japanese society, however, other tendencies and more realistic and constructive views on prospects for Japanese-Soviet relations and tasks of the upcoming bilateral talks can be observed. According to supporters of these views, Japanese-Soviet relations must start being improved not by putting tough pressure on the Soviet Union and not by giving out ultimatums, but by creating an atmosphere of friendship.

Perhaps the most significant testimony to the changes in favor of good-neighborly dialogue in the sentiments of a number of influential groupings in the Japanese political world was the constituent meeting in Tokyo of a large group of deputies from the ruling Liberal Democratic Party which launched a new association "For Friendship Between Japan and the USSR." The founders of the association are 190 conservative legislators, including some of the country's influential politicians, such as Shintaro Abe, Noboru Takeshita, and Issio Sakurauti [name as transliterated].

The participants in the constituent meeting listened with great interest to the address made by L.A. Chizhov, USSR ambassador to Japan, and V.M. Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who came from Moscow.

The audience warmly applauded the text of a greetings message addressed to the participants in the constituent meeting from the USSR president which was then read out by the Soviet guest.

The creation of such an association a month before the beginning of the visit to Japan by the USSR president is undoubtedly an important event. The Japanese public views this as an big step on the road to improving Soviet-Japanese relations. This step can be seen as a good omen enabling us to hope that realistic principles will finally prevail in the Japanese Government's stance during the upcoming high-level bilateral talks.

Academician Views ROK Economic Cooperation

SK1903094091 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Interview with Mikhail Titarenko, doctor of philosophy, director of the Far East Institute at the USSR Academy of Sciences, and head of the recent delegation to the ROK, by unidentified reporter, on his recent visit to the ROK; place and date not given—from the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] Mikhail Titarenko said about his recent visit to the ROK:

[Titarenko] For a week we stayed in the ROK. We saw Seoul and toured big industrial cities such as Changwon and Taegu. We even had an enjoyable time at the famous recreation centers in Kyongju.

The main objective of our visit was to participate in the ROK-USSR academic seminar. The prospect of economic cooperation between the two countries was discussed at the seminar.

Approximately 200 representatives of ROK companies participated in the seminar. This fact proves that the ROK is greatly interested in the development of relations with the Soviet Union in the fields of economy, culture, sports, science, technology, and other issues.

Speeches by members of our delegation at the seminar prompted a large number of questions and points from our ROK colleagues. It was said that a great number of the ROK delegation had an interest in expanding cooperation with our country, but some asserted that they should restrain themselves from developing relations in such a way.

In connection with this, we tried to persuade them to believe that cooperation with our country will be complementary cooperation.

[Reporter] There are some assertions that the recent development of relations between the USSR and the ROK will have a positive impact on the situation on the Korean peninsula. Did you discuss this problem at the academic seminar?

[Titarenko] We met and conversed with ROK politicians, leaders of the political parties, and persons close to President No Tae-u. I was very satisfied with their consciousness that the international climate surrounding USSR-ROK cooperation, the Korean peninsula, and the Asian-Pacific region should be sound. I did not feel any

attempt to have USSR-ROK relations replace those between the DPRK and ourselves. Furthermore, the ROK delegation asserted that the Soviet Union should continue to promote relations with the ROK while developing friendly relations with the DPRK. This will help promote North-South dialogue. In addition, we saw Changwon's industrial enterprises and could understand the work of the ROK Agricultural Cooperative Association [Nongjangju Hyophoe]. I think that their experience will be useful in our country.

The prestige of the Soviet Union and of President Gorbachev is very high in the ROK. Because of this, they are paying much attention to events taking place in our country. They really wish that the policy of restructuring, which was initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal, will come true in the future.

Near East & South Asia

Reports Continue on Postwar Mideast Crisis

Anti-Saddam Movement Assessed

91UF0551A Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 Mar 91 p 3

[Report by IAN correspondent S. Kanayev for TRUD: "Iraq: Cup of Patience Runneth Over"]

[Text] Abu Dhabi, 12 March—With the end of hostilities in the Persian Gulf Iraq has found itself faced with economic catastrophe. But its causes go deeper than the visible results of the nighttime raids of American Stealth or British Tornado aircraft. Even before 2 August of last year the Iraqi economy was in crisis. Iraq's foreign debt amounted to more than $80 billion. Of these, approximately $60 billion were owed to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, $10 billion to the Soviet Union.

The economic factor, specialists believe, played not the least part in the adoption of the decision to seize Kuwait. During the occupation the Iraqis pillaged and carried off valuables, equipment and property totaling approximately $25 billion. About a month after the invasion Sa'dun Hammadi, deputy prime minister of Iraq, declared that, having incorporated Kuwait, Iraq could resolve all its economic problems.

At the same time, the state situated on the fertile land of the Tigris and Euphrates interfluve could by no means be considered poor, particularly by "Third World" standards. Oil exports provided Iraq in peace time with approximately $18 billion a year, given a population of 15-17 million. However, per capita income in this country was steadily declining. At the same time, there was in inverse proportion to it an increase in spending on the Army, which in terms of numbers had moved into fourth place in the world. In the period from 1980 through 1988 (the war with Iran) per capita income declined 25 percent as a whole. Military spending, on the other hand, grew by 31 percent a year on average. A loss of 61 percent of oil revenues and available hard currency reserves totaling $35 billion were a result of the war with Iran also.

Iraq has known practically no peaceful life in the past 20 years: The constant military operations, sometimes subsiding, sometimes resuming with new force, in Iraqi Kurdistan, the eight-year war with Iraq and, finally, the Kuwait adventure.

The defeat in Kuwait was the last drop filling Iraqis' cup of patience to overflowing. Reports of protests not only in Basra and Kurdistan but the central areas of the country and in Baghdad itself are coming in. According to certain reports, several attempts on S. Husayn's life have already been made. The myth of the monolithic strength of the ruling regime formed over the years with the aid of subtle propaganda is being dispelled.

The public protests, which have now encompassed many of the country's cities, represent spontaneous anger, without, naturally, a single leadership or common organization. The main centers of the uprising—and this is no accident—are the northern Kurdish areas and southern Iraq, whose population is primarily Shi'ite. According to unofficial information, the Shi'ite population in Iraq is preponderant—a fact that is carefully concealed by the country's leadership, which is predominantly of Sunni origin. In addition, the Shi'ites, as a rule, constitute the neediest strata of Iraqi society. And this despite the fact that the main Shi'ite Muslim holy places, located in the cities of Najaf and Karbala, are in Iraq.

Ten years ago, when the war with Iraq had flared up, many specialists were of the opinion that one of its causes was the Iraqi leadership's aspiration to use an external conflict to overcome the internal tension, which, under the influence of the "Islamic revolution" in Iran, had assumed a clearly expressed religious nature. The Iraqi leaders' Muslim rhetoric, to which they began to resort at the time of the Kuwait crisis in the hope of winning the support of the Muslim world, should not confuse people: For many years Baghdad had pursued a policy of persecution of the Shi'ites on religious grounds.

The Shi'ite movement would now seem the most dangerous to S. Husayn. This is determined not only by the numbers of Shi'ites, but also the position of neighboring Shi'ite Iran to a large extent. In addition, the Iraqi Shi'ites potentially have an opportunity to create a single organization or directive center. It is sufficient to recall what kind of role was performed by the mosques in the course of the anti-shah revolution in Iran, when they became the principal organizing centers of the movement inside the country.

A different picture is taking shape currently in Kurdistan, in the north of Iraq. Following a number of heavy defeats by the Iraqi regular forces, the Kurdish national movement has in recent years found itself split into small political groups. But this people's aspiration to secure their national rights should not be underestimated. The

struggle against Saddam's regime led to the formation of a coalition of various political groups united under the name of the Kurdistan Front, which is now heading the movement in the north of the country.

A third group currently opposed to the Ba'thist regime in Baghdad are the Iraqi emigres. According to certain figures, more than 1 million Iraqis live outside of Iraq at this time. These are people of the most diverse political beliefs and views. They include communists, the Shi'ite clergy, representatives of various Kurdish parties and national movements, the liberal intelligentsia and military figures who have fallen from favor. The Iraqi emigres are united by two main demands: the ouster of the S. Husayn regime and the organization of an international (or inter-Arab) trial of the head of the regime and the regime itself.

The representatives of more than 30 Iraqi opposition groups have now assembled in Beirut to formulate a common position in the struggle against the Baghdad government. The most influential among them are the Islamic Action Organization and the Supreme Assembly of the Islamic Revolution of Iraq. There is as yet no information allowing us to consider the emigre association a real political force capable of heading the struggle against the ruling regime. Nor is there information on its ties to the insurgents within the country. The development of events in Iraq could contribute to the consolidation of the emigres with the internal political opposition.

The situation in the central parts of Iraq is not entirely clear as yet. It is obvious that under the influence of propaganda indoctrination of many years' standing part of the population remains loyal to the regime, believing even that without S. Husayn even the existence of Iraq itself is impossible. Many people are unprepared for political action now, being paralyzed with fear. No totalitarian state in the world, perhaps, has had so intricate and ramified a system of repression. Some Iraqis overseas say that practically every Iraqi family has its "own" informer.

"After school, I want to joint the Mukhabarat (the general Arab name for counterintelligence and political investigation authorities)," one Iraqi juvenile told me. "It pays and feeds you well. It is easy work."

How many such boys have graduated from such a school? Nor should it be forgotten that in the 70 years of Iraq's existence this country has practically known no form of government other than military dictatorship.

American experts are reporting that S. Husayn has sufficient resources, military primarily, for putting down the public protests. The Iraqi president still has quite widespread support in the Arab world, which also needs to be taken into account. The "Arab man in the street" is impressed by a "strong personality" who volunteered "to put Israel in its place" and he prefers to close his eyes to the events occurring inside Iraq. They do not affect him directly.

As of this time the spontaneous anti-Saddam uprising continues to gain momentum. According to reports, it is being joined by certain regular units of the Iraqi Army. It is difficult to say as yet how the civil war that is flaring up in Iraq will end. The ruling regime has, to all appearances, preserved, despite the military defeat, a reserve of strength, which could enable it to hold out for some time.

How will events develop further? Much will depend on the position of the Army, specifically the forces that extricated themselves from Kuwait....

The news coming from various sources concerning the threat of the use of chemical weapons against the insurgents is disturbing. According to certain information, attempts have already been made to use them in Najaf and Karbala.

Life in Baghdad Described

OW1903061891 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Mar 91

[Report by unidentified correspondent in Baghdad; from the "Utro 120 + 30" program]

[Text] This is how our television group saw the capital after the war. Most administrative buildings were hit, bridges over the Tigris River were destroyed, and telephone centers and exchanges were knocked out.

There is no electricity, gasoline, or foodstuffs in the city and most shops are closed. Only the occasional shopkeeper raises the shutters over the facade of his shop during the day before sunset. City residents have become a rare sight on the streets of Baghdad, once filled with passers by, because during these troubled and extremely complex times the people of Baghdad prefer to stay at home. As far as the great number of vehicles on the streets is concerned, without which it is hard to imagine Baghdad, most of them are up on blocks. It is almost impossible to get any gasoline insofar as all of the country's oil refineries have been destroyed. It could very well be that the ordinary bicycle will now become the main form of transport, replacing the nimble Toyotas and luxurious Chevrolets.

The long list of problems facing the people of Baghdad every day is now headed by the shortage of goods. Prices of rice, flour, and sugar have risen by almost 1,000 percent. But the city, which has been completely cut off from all lines of communication and has been denied almost everything necessary for survival, has not died. Life with all its hardships goes on. Destroyed houses are gradually being restored and the rubble of brick bats and reinforcing rods is being cleared. Enterprising traders who have lost their shops are laying out their simple wares right here on the street at improvised stalls. As a matter of fact, this city street was turned into an improvised football field. People are tired of the war and the hardships. They want to find a distraction from it all, even if for just a short period of time.

The climate in Iraq is changeable in spring. Good weather gives way to sand storms, or Khamsins, but as far as everything else is concerned, we noticed no other changes here.

Peace Committee on U.S., Soviet Mideast Roles

LD1803225191 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—The Middle East after the Gulf War was the subject of an international round-table discussion at the Soviet Peace Committee on Monday.

Many speakers voiced concern over the continuing foreign military presence in the Gulf, as well as over the fact that the U.N. Security Council resolutions on the Arab-Israeli conflict found themselves "suspended in the air", figuratively speaking.

Lieutenant-General Vasily Petrenko, who represents the Soviet public organisation "Soviet Generals for Peace and Disarmament" voiced anxiety at the growing U.S. military supplies to the region, including to Saudi Arabia.

He pointed to the danger of the current departure of the United States from one of the basic principles of new thinking—the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. He said the euphoria in the U.S. political establishment and public opinion after a relatively light victory of the multinational forces over Iraq attested to this.

Konstantin Geivandov, the leading Soviet political analyst specializing in Middle East affairs, said that it was too early to use the words "postwar settlement" with regard to the Gulf region, because despite the end of hostilities, only a truce has been reached in the region.

"Overstepping the framework of the U.N. Mandate, the United States and its allies are now occupying part of Iraqi territory and do not seem to prepare to leave," he reminded, expressing surprise that the United Nations remains passive with regard to the implementation of its resolutions on the Palestinian issue.

Palestine's extraordinary envoy to the USSR said Abu 'Imara also favoured the implementation of the U.N. resolutions on the issue. "Durable peace in the Middle East is impossible without it," he said. "It is also necessary not to create an impression of the Security Council's double standard with regard to its own resolutions (one for the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict and another for the Arab-Israeli conflict—TASS.) [no closing quotation marks as received]

Dmitry Volsky, a political analyst of the ZA RUBEZHOM weekly disagreed with the pessimistic view of the situation expressed by his colleagues. He said Washington was aware of the Soviet Union's continuing influence in the Middle East Region. Now he said, an unprecedented situation had taken shape there: the region's future must be built as never before on Soviet-U.S. interaction.

Israeli Communist Party Leader Visits Moscow

PM1803124191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] T. Tubi, general secretary of the Communist Party of Israel Central Committee, was in Moscow 6 through 13 March. He was received for talks at the CPSU Central Committee International Department and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries.

East Europe

Polish Foreign Minister Comments on Relations

LD1803231191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1558 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Valentin Volkov]

[Text] Warsaw, 18 Mar (TASS)—Poland attaches great importance in its foreign policy to relations with the Soviet Union on a new basis, Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski said at a news conference held today. Although no talks on concluding a Polish-Soviet treaty on cooperation and neighborliness have begun, the Polish Foreign Ministry has already almost completed drafting of such a treaty, which will be passed on to the USSR's government soon, he said. A similar project is being worked on by the Soviet side, and discussion of the two documents will make a good basis for talks. The formula for Soviet-Polish cooperation in the security sphere is being considered, but without any alliance. What needs to be ensured here is a reliable balance.

Replying to a question about the coming visit to the Soviet Union by Poland's President Lech Walesa, K. Skubiszewski said that since L. Walesa became president of Poland he has considered various important steps in relations with the USSR to be necessary, among them a meeting with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. The Soviet side has also seen the need for this. The strategic weight of relations with the USSR is such that this has been at the focus of President Walesa's attention from the very begining.

The minister noted the great attention which Poland attaches to wide-ranging bilateral trade and economic relations with the USSR, particularly taking into account the cessation of the activities of the CEMA, although it continues to aim for closer ties with the EEC and the development of cooperation with Europan economic organizations. In his opinion, the countries participating in it have no need of the formation of a second EEC, and moreover this would create complications in relations

with the West. But various kinds of consultations and an exchange of views and information on problems that will continue to exist for a long time will be needed, since the process of transition from a state-run to a market economy is very complicated. Hence the need for an organized exchange of views, which might take place, for example, in a consultative committee, which would not meanwhile be a second CEMA.

K. Skubiszewski replied to one question by saying that conjectures or apprehensions about Poland possibly having territorial expectations as a result of possible changes in the USSR have no justification whatsoever. We consider our present eastern border final in its entirety and not subject to change, he said.

Speaking about the problems of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of Poland and the transit of a contingent of the Western Group of Forces, the minister noted that Poland never had any intention to block the withdrawal of troops from the territory of the former GDR, for this withdrawal is in line with the interests of the whole of Europe and of Poland. Poland is ready to look after the necessary transit, to which end a special legal settlement is needed in case of possible difficulties and conflicts, so that this major operation can proceed calmly. K. Skubiszewski again expressed the view that it would be better were Soviet troops to leave Poland's territory before the peak in withdrawals from the FRG. The sides need to look for flexible solutions here, he observed.

Pavlov, CSFR Official Hold News Conference

PM1903122091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by S. Mushkaterov: "Slovak Premier's News Conference"]

[Text] A delegation from the Slovak Republic government, headed by its chairman Vladimir Meciar, is in Moscow on a working visit at the USSR government's invitation. TASS reports that he was received 14 March by USSR Prime Minister V. Pavlov. There was an exchange of views on a number of questions pertaining to Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation. The TASS report states that V. Pavlov is confident that overcoming the difficulties in the USSR and CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federal Republic] economy will have a positive influence on economic links between the two countries and on other spheres in their bilateral relations.

After the Moscow meetings, a news conference was organized for journalists at which V. Meciar spoke of understandings which had been reached.

According to V. Meciar, a wide circle of questions was discussed at the meeting with USSR Prime Minister V. Pavlov, which lasted for over an hour. In particular, the two sides exchanged views on the federal structure of Czechoslovakia and also on preparations for the new USSR Union treaty. Questions concerning economic cooperation between Czechoslovakia and Slovakia and the USSR were discussed. In this connection, V. Meciar announced that the sides have agreed to create in the near future a Russian-Slovak bank in Bratislava with Soviet and Slovak enterprises as shareholders. As a commercial bank, the prices and exchange rates for hard currency will be established there by mutual agreement. It is expected that this bank will provide a basis for organizing extensive goods exchanges on a barter basis and through clearing.

During a meeting between V. Meciar and I. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, it was agreed that a treaty on mutual cooperation over an extended period between the governments of Slovakia and the RSFSR will be signed within a month. Moreover, this document will be supplemented by individual protocols. It is also expected that an agreement on mutual goods exchanges between the Russian Federation and Slovakia will be signed, opening up possibilities for goods exchanges between enterprises, setting up joint enterprises, and developing entrepreneurial activity in third countries' markets.

Many of the questions at the news conference concerned the situation in Slovakia and the possibility of the Czechoslovak Federation collapsing. In this connection, V. Meciar was at pains to explain the situation in this republic and the differentiation of political forces going on there. In particular he stressed that the processes under way in the republic will not lead to the destruction of the Czechoslovak Federation. At the same time, V. Meciar said: We unequivocally support the view that Slovakia should be constituted as a sovereign republic, because only a sovereign republic can delegate part of its authority to the federation. There must be discussions on how the future state should look and how its functions will be distributed between the republics and the federation. We see the federation as a formation acting in the interests of the republics and in possession of fewer powers than it has now, V. Meciar said. The federation must serve both the Czechs and the Slovaks. If it does this, who will seek to destroy it? V. Meciar also stressed that according to statistics only 12-15 percent of the Slovak population wants Czechoslovakia to collapse. The rest are against this.

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Continues Moscow Visit 18 Mar

Gorbachev Talks Detailed

PM1903123591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 March 91 Second Edition, p 1,5

[Text] On 18 March the USSR president had a meeting with Hans-Dietrich Genscher, German vice-chancellor and minister of foreign affairs, here.

The importance of the visit of Genscher, a prominent political figure who has played such an important role in German-Soviet rapprochement, has also been emphasised by the fact that precisely on these days the ratification of treaties finally formalised the sovereignty of reunited Germany.

Gorbachev spoke of the end of a whole postwar stage in Europe and the world and the beginning of a new one, the constructive principles of which have already been laid down and in which the Soviet-German factor plays an outstanding role.

The two leaders thoroughly analysed the circumstances, objective and subjective prerequisites that made the historic turn in relations between the two great peoples possible. Such a turn could happen only provided a policy coincides with sentiments in society and there is the will which manifested itself not only in statements but in specific deeds as well.

Genscher reaffirmed the determination of the German people and the government of the Federal Republic, by relying on the treaties and agreements, consistently and firmly to build new relations with the USSR, being aware of all their importance for both Europe and the world as a whole.

Notwithstanding all divergences of opinion between Germans, there is "consensus" among them about an evaluation of the role of Gorbachev and the Soviet Union in bringing about the reunification of their native land and sentiments of unshakeable gratitude for this, Genscher said.

Gorbachev, while agreeing with the evaluation of the truly strategic importance of the Soviet-German reconciliation, pointed out that the attitude of the population and authorities to Soviet troops that still remain on German territory is also very important for the future. Genscher assured that everything would be done for Soviet soldiers to carry away good recollections of their stay in Germany and leave the country as friends.

Soviet-German cooperation develops in no easy conditions, it was pointed out during the Gorbachev-Genscher meeting. This is connected with the deepest changes in the Soviet Union and with the difficulties of integration of Eastern lands into an all-German entity, with a new stage of West European integration, and disquieting processes in some countries of South-Eastern Europe—in short, with everything that distinguishes the current transitional period.

Genscher, having highly appreciated the establishment of relations between the Soviet Union and the European communities and, specifically, the recent meeting between Gorbachev and the EC "leading trio" (Gianni de Michelis, Jacques Poos and Hans Van Den Broek), said that the progress of the EC is important not only from the economic point of view but also for the entire culture of coexistence of nations and states as an example of overcoming centrifugal nationalism and asserting European thinking against the background of unfavourable events in some European countries.

Much attention during the meeting was devoted to transformations in the Soviet Union, which approached the line when it is necessary to translate new forms of living into reality, and therefore they are bringing about a particular strain in society.

Having pointed out the worthy attitude of Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Hans-Dietrich Genscher towards the recent wave of suspicions as to whether the policy of perestroyka remained steady, Gorbachev reaffirmed the unchanged character of the basic policy which he will pursue, notwithstanding all difficulties and aggravations, keeping the process within a democratic, constitutional framework.

Transformations in the Soviet Union are a world problem. Naturally, therefore, that perestroyka is being assisted by really responsible and progressive forces in other countries. Germany is making its major contribution as well.

Gorbachev and Genscher discussed some specific aspects of Germany's support for the Soviet Union at present, taking into account the factor of time and specific tension in connection with the new steps in the implementation of economic reform.

In this context, they also examined specific forms of mutually advantageous cooperation, including connected with sales of military installations left by Soviet troops in Germany, conversion and the development of the power complex in the Soviet Union.

When discussing reform of the Union, Mikhail Gorbachev expressed hope that positive results of the referendum and the prompt signing of the treaty of Union will help divide powers between the centre and republics more quickly. They will feel full-blooded states, and the centre will be given the opportunity to more effectively exercise functions of vital importance to all which will be delegated to it, including the international role of this great power.

Genscher touched on the problem of Soviet ethnic Germans and the restoration of their autonomy. "We have a firm desire," the president said, "to solve this problem in a good way, but so far we have failed to find a painless solution. People in this country respect Germans, and we do not want them to leave. They have done nothing to disgrace themselves during the more than two centuries of their life in Russia. But the territorial problem for their autonomy is complicated by the fact that too much time has passed since they were exiled from their land." The president said he intended to meet representatives of Soviet Germans shortly.

Gorbachev and Genscher recalled the 50th anniversary of the invasion of the Soviet Union by Hitlerite troops at the beginning of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people. They agreed to arrange consultation of ways to

mark the date—by condemning fascism and everything that deserved condemnation and paying tribute to the victims of the war, while foregrounding the significance of the radical change in relations between the two peoples, their reconciliation and prospects for future cooperation.

When discussing European problems, Gorbachev and Genscher stated that in realisation of the ideas set out in the charter for a New Europe, they attach special importance to the forthcoming European foreign ministers meeting in Berlin, the first one after the Paris conference.

Gorbachev informed Genscher of the talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, including those on the treaty on conventional arms. The president expressed confidence that a solution would be found.

It is important, however, that this kind of concerns, which may arise, do not develop into a "credibility gap". There are no grounds for that, Gorbachev said.

Genscher and Gorbachev exchanged views on the role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in new conditions. "NATO's transformation from the viewpoint of forming all-European security structures is not quite obvious to us. It is, rather a question of strengthening the mechanism of security only for those that are members of that organisation," Gorbachev remarked.

Genscher defended the positive role of NATO. In so doing he made an important statement: "The frontier that used to divide Europe and ran across Germany should disappear for ever, and not just shift towards the Western border of the Soviet Union. A Europe of the future can be only a Europe with the participation of the Soviet Union."

Gorbachev and Genscher reaffirmed their unchanged positions: a powerful European space presupposes organic involvement of the United States and Canada. On various occasions during the meeting they emphasised the basic role of Soviet-U.S. mutual understanding and interaction for world politics.

They exchanged views on a settlement of the postwar situation in the Gulf, and in the Middle East as a whole.

The events in the region, just as was the case with German reunification earlier, were a very important test of the world community's ability to master new methods to resolve international problems, Gorbachev said.

The world community, on the whole, stood the test. Cooperation which manifested itself, apart from other things, demonstrated immense possibilities of new approaches to world politics and of the long-term potential of the United Nations organisation, he said.

The Gorbachev-Genscher conversation was one of those meetings which not only reaffirm commitment to one's obligations, to the chosen policy of cooperation and mutual support, not only strengthen political and personal trust. The importance of such meetings is in the fact that they are followed by practical actions that deepen actual cooperation.

Present at the meeting were Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, Juergen Chrobog, and Ambassador Klaus Blech.

Holds News Conference

LD1803162891 Moscow TASS in English 1607 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Ryabikin and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow March 18 TASS—"I thanked President Mikhail Gorbachev for the Soviet Union's policy that led to fundamental changes in the world and Europe, helped overcome the split of Germany and restore German unity," German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher told a news conference here today.

Genscher, on a two-day working visit here, was speaking after three-hours of talks with the Soviet president.

In his opening address the minister stressed that the significance of the visit also consisted in the fact that it was his first visit to the Soviet Union as the foreign minister of united Germany.

On his talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, Hans-Dietrich Genscher pointed out that "after the restoration of German unity and sovereignty, this is a new major starting point for the further development of German-Soviet relations and for the contribution the two countries can make to the development in Europe and the whole world."

"We are fully determined to further develop this cooperation, deepen it and use for stability in Europe," Hans-Dietrich Genscher said.

For Germany it is important, he continued, to see no new borders appear on the continent after the unification of the German state. In this connection the German minister attached special importance to the forthcoming first meeting of the foreign ministers of signatory countries of the Paris Charter for a new Europe. The meeting is scheduled for July in Berlin. According to Genscher, the meeting must give new impulses to the process of peaceful restructuring on the continent and the creation of new structures.

This, Genscher stressed, is important for countries in central and eastern Europe which are seeking a new place for themselves on the continent after the annulment of the military structures of the Warsaw Treaty organisation.

The German foreign minister told the news conference that during his talks with Aleksandr Bessmertnykh he advised the Soviet foreign minister to pay a visit soon to

the foreign ministers of the Common Market countries in Brussels or Luxembourg for a political dialogue.

Genscher also favored a visit by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to NATO headquarters in Brussels. This, he said, would reflect new interrelations which have taken shape recently between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and the former Warsaw Pact, as well as the Soviet Union.

Genscher expressed confidence that for purposes of confidence-building in Europe, it is important that relations between the two great powers—the United States and the Soviet Union—should develop positively.

As regards disarmament negotiations, Hans-Dietrich Genscher said that during talks in Moscow, no solution was found to the problem of conventional arms but an agreement on this issue could be reached in accordance with the already signed treaty on conventional arms in Europe.

Genscher said that the situation in the Middle East was in the focus of talks in Moscow. The sides, Genscher said, believe that as a result of responsible actions by the permanent member-countries of the U.N. Security Council with regard to Iraq's aggression, the United Nations was able to play the role visualized in its charter.

The German foreign minister stressed that in his opinion, the country which has twice acted as aggressor lately should not be allowed to possess chemical and other weapons of mass destruction.

When discussing bilateral relations, Hans-Dietrich Genscher told the Soviet leadership "with all seriousness about the position and expectations of the Federal Government following the transfer of Erich Honecker to the USSR".

On other aspects of talks, Genscher told journalists that he had briefed the Soviet president on the talk he had with representatives of Soviet ethnic Germans on Monday morning.

In particular, he noted, Mikhail Gorbachev was informed about Soviet Germans' hopes for the restoration of their autonomy in the Soviet Union. He also requested that the Soviet president received representatives of Soviet Germans. Genscher was given a positive answer. Only if they have the prospect to recreate their republic, the German minister said, the Soviet Germans will be able to decide in favour of staying in the Soviet Union.

Asked about the German contribution to the solution of the problem of Soviet Germans, Hans-Dietrich Genscher said: "We can make our contribution to the development of culture and education. Germany is interested in having those who have found their homeland in the Soviet Union stay where they are, because they do not have sufficient chances to find their place under new conditions".

From what Gorbachev told him about the domestic situation in the Soviet Union, Hans-Dietrich Genscher drew a conclusion that the Soviet leader was fully determined to continue reforms and that he is well aware of the scale of problems facing his country.

"Mikhail Gorbachev regards Germany as one of the countries which are helping his reform policy," the German minister said. "This meets German interests as well".

After the news conference, Hans-Dietrich Genscher was scheduled to meet former Soviet foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze. After that, Hans-Dietrich Genscher was due to leave Moscow.

Interviewed on Relations

LD1803205991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1852 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Interview with FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher by correspondent Aleksandr Zholkver; place and date not given; comments are in German with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Zholkver] The working visit to Moscow by Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG deputy federal chancellor and minister of foreign affairs, has ended. He was received by President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and he had talks with Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh. Mr. Minister, this is your first visit to Moscow since the ratification of the Soviet-German treaties by the USSR Supreme Soviet. How do you assess the current level of relations between our countries?

[Genscher] This visit indeed acquires particular significance by being the first visit to Moscow by the minister of foreign affairs of a united Germany, following its gaining full sovereignty. This has given us the opportunity to sum up the results of the development of relations between our countries. We assess this development as positive. It has provided the opportunity to considerably improve the whole situation in Europe. It is largely to the merit of the Soviet Union that Germany was able to gain its unity, and we very much appreciate this.

The united Germany will cooperate even more closely with the Soviet Union, in the spirit of the so-called grand treaty that we signed in autumn last year. The aim of the treaty is to develop relations between Germany and the Soviet Union in the interests of both our countries and of Europe as a whole, in the interests of the stability and unity of the European continent.

[Zholkver] How is the process of ratification of the treaties with the Soviet Union going in the FRG legislature?

[Genscher] We submitted the Grand Treaty and the treaty on economic cooperation on 15 March for endorsement by the Bundestag. I take it that the ratification of these important documents will happen in the near future. For my part, I hope that the two treaties

which have not yet been endorsed by the USSR Supreme Soviet will also be ratified in the near future. In that way, we will be able to put the whole package of treaties into effect.

[Zholkver] I would also like to ask a question which would really be better addressed to the FRG minister of economics: Which aspects of our economic cooperation do you consider the most important?

[Genscher] Our two states can complement each other very well in economic terms. The Soviet Union possesses big natural resources and sources of energy, while Germany has highly developed industry. Cooperation could thus be particularly useful here. We have an interest in the Soviet Union being able, through modernization of its economy, to put its resources more successfully at the service of the people.

We wish success for the reforms which are being implemented in your country in the name of the good of your citizens. We recognize that it is thanks to the market economy that we have been able to ensure a high standard of living for the population of our country, and an unprecedented level of social justice. We wish with all our hearts for the people of your country to attain this in the near future.

[Zholkver] Do you not believe that political stability is also required for such successful development of the economy? At your news conference, you mentioned in particular that you talked about yesterday's referendum in your conversation with the president.

[Genscher] You are indeed correct. Economic stability cannot be separated from political stability. Such stability is also necessary to ensure social justice. We sincerely wish for the Soviet Union to resolve its difficult internal problems by way of dialogue, without the use of force. Dialogue needs mutual respect and mutual understanding in the spirit of the Charter for a New Europe adopted in Paris in November last year. That charter reaffirms the need for respect for human rights and the rights of peoples to self-determination, and the recognition of the importance of democratic freedoms and of a market economy.

[Zholkver] You observed at your news conference that this applies to the Soviet Germans, as well.

[Genscher] Yes, we know that the Soviet Germans have experienced several difficult decades. They were accused of crimes that they had not committed. The Germans in the Soviet Union are in no way responsible for the criminal war of Hitlerite Germany against the USSR. What should be discussed now is how to give Germans back their national identity in the Soviet Union, their culture. It is necessary to put a complete end to discrimination against them, for they are, I know, totally loyal citizens of the USSR. They are not responsible for the suffering inflicted on your people by Hitler's Germany. I think it is particularly appropriate to recall this this year, the year of the 50th anniversary of Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union. We should specially mark this memorable date in our history on 22 June, in order to draw lessons from the past, to prevent any repetition of the fateful past, and make every effort to create a new relationship between our peoples.

[Zholkver] Do you not think that, taking this into account, it would be particularly appropriate to undertake specific steps this year toward disarmament in Europe?

[Genscher] Yes, you are quite right. Such a conclusion follows from the decisions adopted at the Paris meeting of heads of European states. I hope that the as yet unresolved issues of the practical implementation of the treaty on reduction of conventional weapons signed in Paris will be settled in the near future, so as to embark as soon as possible on this practical disarmament. We Germans have already made our important contribution to this cause by reducing our armed forces considerably. Their numbers in united Germany will be less than previously existed in West German, to say nothing of the former GDR. This goes to show that we are striving to manifest good will in questions of disarmament, as well. We hope that other European states will follow our example.

[Zholkver] We see, however, that issues of security are not confined to just one continent. This is also shown by the recent events in the Persian Gulf.

[Genscher] Indeed, security cannot be limited to the confines of just one continent. Security is not, however, just a military problem. Security also affects political cooperation, economic stability, and ecological stability, and the mutual respect of peoples, which should not be set against each other. It is important that we are now aware of how mistaken the previous policy of the industrially developed states, both Western and Eastern, was, when they armed countries of the region and thus set them against each other. I think that disarmament is sorely needed in that region, too. These countries need economic development and social justice and not weapons.

[Zholkver] A final question: How will our dialogue develop further?

[Genscher] I hope that my Soviet colleague will be able to put into practice as soon as possible the invitation issued to him to visit Bonn.

[Zholkver] Thank you very much for the interview.

Departs 18 Mar

LD1803183891 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Excerpt] Moscow March 18 TASS—German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher left the Soviet Union tonight.

He had talks with his Soviet counterpart Aleksandr Bessmertnykh here on March 17-18. They discussed in-depth the state of and prospects for the development of relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic. [passages omitted]

Commentary Assesses Visit

LD1803174591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] The visit of the FRG Foreign Minister to the Soviet Union is coming to an end, and the time has come to sum up its results. I have asked my colleague Viktor Levin to do this.

[Levin] One can judge the significance of the visit, at any rate, by the fact that it was the first reception in the USSR of a foreign minister of a united Germany. In his capacity as the head of the foreign policy department of the West German state, Genscher has been in our country repeatedly, but this is the first time he has come in his new capacity. This is important, not only for him but for us as well. In the center of attention were questions of bilateral relations, European security, a settlement in the Persian Gulf zone and in the entire Mideast, and the problem of disarmament. Speaking at a news conference to Soviet and foreign journalists, Genscher said, in particular:

[Begin Genscher recording in German with simultaneous translation into Russian] I have thanked President Gorbachev and the foreign minister for the Soviet Union's policy, which contributes to a fundamental change in the situation in the world and has made it possible for us to overcome the division of Europe, and for us Germans to gain state unity. [end recording]

[Levin] I want to note that in his opening statement and in his answers the German minister repeatedly spoke of the responsibility of Germany for the stability of Europe and for the development of good-neighborly relations. Genscher mentioned that in his conversation with Gorbachev the question of the 50th anniversary of the invasion of the Soviet Union by Hitler's Germany was raised. The minister stressed that both sides remember that tragic date with a view to the future. Germany, Genscher said, understands the need to remember once more its responsibility.

As it was easy to predict, during the talks and at the news conference the question was raised of the former leader of the former GDR, Honecker, who was taken from the Soviet military hospital near Berlin to the USSR for a thorough medical examination, in view of the deterioration of his health. There is the medical side of the question, no doubt, but on the legal side the Germans are expressing themelves fairly sharply and, judging by everything, not without reason. But I got the impression that Genscher was certainly not trying to inflame passions, to coin a phrase. The visit, and Genscher stressed this, was useful and constructive. The Soviet side makes the same appraisal of it.

Supreme Soviet

Session Resumes After Recess; Agenda Outlined

LD1903101391 Moscow TASS in English 1002 GMT 19 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Boris Zverev and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow March 19 TASS—The Soviet parliament today resumed its deliberations after a week-long recess connected with the holding of the March 17 referendum on the country's future.

Vladimir Orlov, chairman of the referendum organising committee, told deputies that the absolute majority of the USSR's voters gave a "yes" answer to the referendum question.

On the session agenda, Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov said that deputies would consider today the second reading of a bill on the Cabinet.

Meeting requests from several deputies, the parliament will also hear the Soviet prime minister's report "On all issues connected with the price reform."

The parliament is to consider within the next ten days bills on the customs code, customs duties and principles of enterprise in the USSR.

Principles of civil legislation are to be discussed in the first reading at a joint sitting of the two houses of the national parliament. At separate sittings, the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities will examine bills on invention and on the Supreme Court.

The parliament is to ratify several international documents, including the agreement on instituting the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, cooperation treaties with France and Italy and agreements between the USSR and Germany.

Orlov Gives 'Preliminary' Referendum Figures

LD1903091591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0811 GMT 19 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Sergey Ivanov and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Mar (TASS)—According to preliminary data, 136 million people took part in the nationwide referendum on 17 March. Vladimir Orlov, chairman of the USSR commission for holding the referendum, cited these figures in an address at the session of the country's Supreme Soviet, which took place in the Kremlin. He said that central commissions for holding the referendum had been set up in nine unions and 18 autonomous republics. On 17 March, 74 percent of the citizens who had the right to vote went to the polls in the Russian Soviet Federated Soviet Republic; 83.5 percent in the Ukraine; 82.5 percent in Belorussia; 95.4 percent in Uzbekistan; 88.3 percent in Kazakhstan; 74.9 percent in Azerbaijan; 92.8 percent in Kyrgyztan; 94.4 percent in Tajikistan; 97.7 percent in Turkemenia. In a number of regions, the referendum took place in very difficult conditions, where its holding was blocked, and in some places polling stations were destroyed. Nevertheless, despite this even there people found the courage to express their opinion on the questions put forward for nationwide voting, Vladimir Orlov stressed.

The deputes also listened to reports on the voting in the republics, where the decision has been made not to hold the USSR referendum.

Reports on Poll in Baltics, Moldova, Ossetia

LD1903111191 Moscow TASS in English 1039 GMT 19 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Members of the Soviet legislature who visited constituent republics to monitor the course of the nationwide referendum on March 17 today reported to parliament about the voting in the Baltics, Moldavia and South Ossetia.

Deputies pointed to the courage of the people who decided to participate in the plebiscite on their country's future in regions where local authorities had banned the poll.

Valeriy Tsybukh said that 95 per cent of the voters who took part in the referendum in Estonia were in favour of preserving the country's unity.

The deputy emphasised that they had to resist "moral and psychological pressure."

Tsybukh described numerous difficulties that faced electoral commissions and an attack on one polling station.

Anatoliy Chekhoyev described the tense situation in South Ossetia. The area's administrative centre, Tskhinvali, had been under continuous fire for the previous three days, he said. Four people were killed on the night before the referendum.

Chekhoyev said that out of 43,000 people who took part in the poll (72 per cent of registered voters), only nine people said "no" to union.

Describing events in South Ossetia as "a real civil war," Chekhoyev said that Georgian National Guard units, complete with armoured vehicles, moved towards Tskhinvali. "It is not an inter-ethnic conflict between Ossetians and Georgians, but a political one—one side wants to remain in the union, the other does not."

Yuriy Blokhin, a deputy from Moldavia, said that "the referendum was held in very difficult conditions." This was largely due "to the republican leadership's efforts to prevent the poll."

Blokhin said that state bodies received directives to file criminal proceedings against citizens for organising and participating in the referendum.

Nonetheless, he said, out of 108,000 voters who cast ballot papers in Kishinev, 101,000 were for the union, and 856 against. Many ballot papers were stolen.

"People wanted to take part in the referendum, but were not able to. The USSR Prosecutor's Office should take action against those who hindered the holding of the referendum," Blokhin said.

Lukyanov Interview on Democracy, Referendum

PM1503125491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 p 2

[Interview with Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by correspondents A. Pankratov and I. Sichka; date and place not given: "Anatoliy Lukyanov: 'Maybe We Did the Most Difficult Thing...'"]

[Text]

On Democracy and "Democrats"

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Anatoliy Ivanovich, not so long ago, few people would have allowed their commitment to democracy to be called into question. But these days the words "democrat" and "democracy" are increasingly frequently used between quotation marks and in a negative sense, while the idea of deepening and developing the democratization processes is increasingly rarely present in the speeches of top state officials. What do you think about this and in what direction, in your view, should the process of democratization of society develop? How would you personally define your political creed in this context?

[Lukyanov] My creed was and is unchanged: the development of all aspects of our Soviet democracy. I don't think anyone in the country's leadership is calling these ideas into question. Democratization cannot be a tactical move, it is a strategic line, a most important component of the reforms that have begun.

We have only taken the first steps. What next? First, the strengthening of political, economic, and individual human rights, the provision of guarantees for these rights, broader participation for working people in deciding state and public affairs, and the consolidation of glasnost.

Another important avenue is the real viability of democracy in the elected organs, soviets at all levels. True, we are now hearing from right and left that the soviet form of democracy is obsolete, that the soviets should be replaced by permanently operating legislatures and municipalities with elected or appointed mayors. And people say, without batting an eyelid, that the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" was needed only temporarily, "when it was a matter of the transfer of power from the party to the soviets. But times change, and slogans change. What was necessary yesterday could be reactionary today." I quote the well-known champion of democracy I.I. Zaslavskiy (see KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA for 2 March 1991—editor's note), who, incidentally, was also criticized by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. After statements like that, it is impossible to avoid putting the word "democrat" in the quotation marks that upset you so much.

And people go even further. They demand the dissolution of the Congress of People's Deputies, when only yesterday they proposed to transfer all power to it; they demand the abolition of the USSR Supreme Soviet, when only recently they wanted to obtain places on it and proposed that half of it be renewed. And I am not surprised when these champions of democratization are also called democrats in quotation marks.

We now need at least relative stability in social relations and elementary labor and production discipline. Unless we achieve this, we will be unable to make progress in economic transformations.

International experience shows that such progress is inconceivable without firm law and order. Yet in our country we are up against really amazing things. Realizing that the further development of economic reform is impossible without strengthening the rule of law, the country's Supreme Soviet and president and now also the Cabinet of Ministers are taking concrete steps in this direction. How could you describe as undemocratic, for instance, the measures adopted by the president to safeguard the most important human right—the right to life?

I recently came across this argument: Gorbachev once uttered a memorable phrase: "We need democracy like the air we breathe," but Yanayev has stated that "we need order like the air we breathe." A telling conclusion is drawn from this: The perestroyka plane has landed. But why? Please tell me, why are democracy and discipline, democracy and order counterposed as if they were at opposite poles? You would think that progress in this direction would be supported by all the democrats, who only recently were calling for strong presidential power and the dominance of the law. But no. It transpires that some people find it inconvenient to operate within a firm legal framework, and any progress toward order and toward the strengthening of the foundations of power in the course of democratization is declared to be progress toward dictatorship, authoritarianism, and arbitrary rule. So there is another reason why the word democrat is enclosed in quotation marks both in the press and in daily life.

Last, the democratization process also means the consistent development of political pluralism and a multiparty system, the expression of the population's will and interests through various movements and social associations. And we must learn to see pluralism not only as differences of opinion, but also as the desire to compare and contrast different opinions and the art of formulating acceptable solutions on the basis of dialogue. But

this interpretation of political pluralism does not suit a certain section of politicians, they would rather go on singing that "all our life is a struggle." And since it is a struggle, it is impossible to conceal the consuming desire to sweep from the political arena your rivals and competitors in the shape of, say, the Communist Party and the Communist Youth League [Komsomol]. And it is not only words, not only statements that no prisoners will be taken from the Smolnyy [Leningrad party Headquarters] or Staraya Ploshchad [CPSU Central Committee Headquarters] and that 16 million lampposts will be found to string up the 16 million Communists. It is also the formulation of the laws in certain republics, it is moral and sometimes physical terror. The champions of this kind of pluralism are not going to be called—excuse me—democrats without quotation marks.

And so today the main thing, it seems to me, is not so much the "quantity" as the "quality" of democracy. The effectiveness of democracy—that is today's slogan, if I can put it like that. And that is what determines my assessment of many speeches by the leaders of the "democrats" (what can you do, I am putting the word in quotation marks), who usually do not associate their demands for the development of democratic institutions with their implications in the spheres of the economy, social security, culture, and sometimes simple morality.

Is the Supreme Soviet Losing Power?

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] A certain narrowing of the Supreme Soviet's functions has been observable recently. It is now devoting less and less attention to questions of the day-to-day government of the country, and in particular has not adopted any decision on the January events in the Baltic region. Some of its legislative rights have been transferred to the president, and then the Cabinet of Ministers requested the same for itself. The impression is growing that the balance between the legislative and executive powers is being disrupted. Does this worry you as chairman of the Supreme Soviet? What principles and mechanisms do you see at the basis of the system of relations between the Supreme Soviet and the president and Cabinet of Ministers?

[Lukyanov] Your question contains words like "observable" and "impression"... I would add to that list the words "story," "assumption," "according to certain information," and "reliable sources say." You see, it has become fashionable in our country to use these outwardly innocuous formulas as a cover for pushing very specific political concepts and views. No offense meant, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA is not alone in this.

I prefer to deal with facts. And they show that there are no reasonable grounds for assumptions about the disruption of the balance between the legislative and executive powers.

Under the Constitution, the Supreme Soviet is still the permanently operating legislative and monitoring organ of USSR state power. Its field of legislative activity, far from narrowing, has in fact widened considerably.

True, at first the USSR Supreme Soviet tried to react to virtually every urgent matter arising in the country. And on the whole that is quite right, because you cannot have a legislature that turns its back on real life. But on the other hand, you can't turn it into a "first aid" team. And therefore, without abandoning the resolution of specific problems of a primarily political nature, the legislature has concentrated its attention chiefly on fulfilling its main function—the legislative function, and also on monitoring the implementation of the laws.

Now, about relations within the triangle: Supreme Soviet, president, Cabinet of Ministers. You see, I think the true picture is concealed or distorted in the press, not least because of the one-sided interpretation of these relations. The true picture is that the decision to delegate to the president—until 31 March 1992—the right to issue decrees in a certain sphere of legislation is due to specific circumstances of the time, circumstances that require a quick reaction to changing conditions and the prompt adoption of measures, including normative measures, to pursue the economic reform, overcome the crisis situation, and strengthen democracy and power. But at the same time—and the press that calls itself independent tries to ignore this—the Supreme Soviet strengthened its own powers directly relating to monitoring the president's activity.

The USSR Supreme Soviet now has the right to recommend that the USSR president amend or repeal a decision adopted by him in the event that in the Supreme Soviet's opinion it does not conform to the USSR Constitution and laws. Furthermore, and this is very important, the Supreme Soviet can at present establish different rules from those enshrined in USSR presidential decrees. People should know these things. And so as not to have to come back to the subject, I will point out that it is my view that in our country, legal education, the development of the population's legal, juridical awareness, is in a mess. I think KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and the other youth publications would do well to start a campaign of education in this sphere.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Nonetheless it is well known that the Constitutional Oversight Committee has found that several presidential decrees do not conform to the Constitution, yet the Supreme Soviet has not reacted in any way...

[Lukyanov] If you stuck to the facts you would notice that when the president requested additional powers it turned out that at that time, the Supreme Soviet had no right to repeal or amend presidential acts... But now, for the first time, the Supreme Soviet is acquiring powers with regard to presidential decisions. You want an example? Fine. We recently adopted a law on the militia, and a whole series of norms in this law went further than the well-known presidential decree. Basically the decree was cribbed from the draft law on the militia. Now it has become law, which in fact was what the Constitutional Oversight Committee requested. In general, in terms of

its powers, the Supreme Soviet takes a resolute line, and the president is quite happy about that.

About relations with the Cabinet of Ministers. These are of course now developing on a new footing, since the Cabinet is directly subordinate to the president, and its contacts with the Supreme Soviet will take place via the president to a greater extent than before. The Cabinet does not have the right of legislative initiative. Draft laws that would previously have been submitted by the Council of Ministers will now be submitted by the president.

At the same time the Supreme Soviet has retained fairly strong levers for directly influencing the Cabinet of Ministers. What are they? The Cabinet is responsible to the Supreme Soviet. It must submit its program of activity to the legislature for examination, and report to the legislature at least once a year. Not to mention the fact that the Supreme Soviet defines in law the Cabinet's area of competence and the procedure for its activity. Finally, our legislature has the right to repeal acts of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers in the event that they do not conform to the USSR Constitution and laws.

That is the system of practical relations that makes each legislative and executive organ "carry its own baggage," as the saying goes. But of course, we still have to assimilate the new relationships properly within the existing mechanism of power. We need a period of acclimatization to the idea that the legislature should not engage in day-to-day administrative functions. Its task is lawmaking and monitoring. Especially because in the near future, the system of power will also have to incorporate the USSR Supreme Control Chamber, which will be subordinate to the Supreme Soviet and responsible for monitoring the receipt and expenditure of union budget funds and the utilization of all-union property. And bringing the USSR State Bank—whose role in regulating economic life is becoming increasingly marked—under the direct jurisdiction of the legislature is another point in response to the question of whether the USSR Supreme Soviet is surrendering and losing power.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from my answer to this question, which unfortunately I was forced to answer at some length: Assertions that the balance between the legislative and executive powers has been disrupted have no solid foundation. Moreover, the full assimilation by representative, executive-administrative, and judicial organs of their prerogatives established by legislation is, in my view, the main way of further developing our state system.

On Economic Reform

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] People are particularly concerned today about the process of economic reform. The Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program, also called the presidential program, had, for all the diversity of opinions of it, a clear orientation. The "Basic Guidelines" adopted by the Soviet Union do not have that kind of clearly comprehensible logical development and thoroughness. Nonetheless, out of the "old" cadres a body that is intended to be new—the Cabinet of Ministers—is being formed. Is this not a repetition of what we have already been through, when first they appoint ministers, and then the program they are to implement is formulated?

[Lukyanov] I don't think it is a repetition of what we have already been through. A different premier, different deputies, and a different orientation of the Cabinet, toward stabilizing the economy and society in order to move forward.

I studied the "500 Days" program very thoroughly. Who rejected it? I am a lawyer, and I always ask: Who stands to gain? Did the center stand to gain from rejecting the "500 Days" program, although it offered opportunities for closer contacts with Russia?! Of course not! But we knew the republics' mood and saw that there was much that they could not accept. And some deputies saw in the program rapid progress toward a capitalist system, while others, on the contrary, saw even "500 Days" as excessively slow progress toward the market. And that, I repeat, is why we were forced to maintain a centrist position. What we cannot allow is large-scale social explosions in the country.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Anatoliy Ivanovich, the two economic programs of N.I. Ryzhkov's government failed to produce the desired results—if anything the situation got worse. The government, and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov himself, have now resigned. What do you think, should the deputies also bear a share of the responsibility for the failure of these programs?

[Lukyanov] I think the country's Supreme Soviet and its deputies are responsible for the programs and decisions they adopt. Just as the republics' Supreme Soviets are responsible for all their documents.

Will the Center Come to Terms With the Republics?

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] On a number of issues, the republic legislatures have taken up a rather tough position with regard to the center. Dialogue between the republics and the center is increasingly frequently pursued in the language of ultimatums: Certain decisions are adopted locally, the center declares them unlawful, the republics do not give way and adopt new decisions, the center repeals them again, and so it goes on. The hopelessness of the further development of relations in this vein is becoming increasingly obvious. Clearly some kind of fundamentally different approach is needed here. Is the center prepared to be the first to take such a step, and what form do you think it could take?

[Lukyanov] First, I cannot agree with the term "center" and the content that is invested in it. Perhaps at someone's prompting, perhaps through lack of thought, but most likely deliberately, the idea is stubbornly imposed on people that some kind of special formation exists

within the country—the "center," with its own interests, aims, and membership—and that it supposedly stands in opposition to the country, the republics, the peoples, and society, engages in a struggle against them, sucks resources out of them, forcibly imposes its own postulates on them, and so forth. People also say that there is the USSR and there are the individual republics, as if the Union were not the totality of the republics, but something capable of existing without them. Although the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet are themselves made up of plenipotentiary representatives, deputies elected by democratic means across the whole country and on a quota basis from each republic and each autonomous formation. It is strange that more than 2,000 USSR people's deputies have been detached from the voters and turned into a "center."

The crux of the problem lies not in the relationship between the republics and the "center," but in relations among the country's 130 peoples, whose prosperity is founded on a shared national economic complex. And if you call things by their names, the attack by the separatist forces is aimed at precisely this—the destruction of the country's economic and sociocultural system.

It is from these stances that the confrontation emanates. Herein lie the origins of interethnic tension. Here are the roots of the war of laws, budgets, presidents, ambitions, and ultimatums. True, the hopelessness of the situation is obvious. But our opponents, and, indeed, the mass media, maintain a shameful silence about what lies behind it.

Look how the "separatists" formulate the question: We need political autonomy and independence, but in other spheres of relations let everything stay the same. Let the "center" continue to worry about "trivia": defense, the power industry, food supplies, shared deliveries, transportation. But life isn't like that. Political relations predetermine all other relations. And if people want to secede from the Union, they will have to secede, with all the consequences that follow from that step. The republics remaining in the Union will obviously safeguard their own interests, that is logical and right.

Thus the "stumbling block" is not the union organs. They have done and are trying to do everything possible to preserve mutual understanding, friendship, and cooperation between peoples. Not to mention the fact that history can provide plenty of examples of situations where the economy alone has made once hostile and warring states abandon the enmity that developed over decades and centuries. Are we more stupid than they are?

And the step that should be taken has already been named: Conclude the Union Treaty.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] The draft Treaty on the Union of Sovereign Republics has been published. Your first comment, please. Why does it say Union of Sovereign Republics, and not states?

[Lukyanov] This draft grew out of draft documents drawn up within a number of republics. A large group of representatives of science and practice, specially authorized by the Supreme Soviets of union and autonomous republics, worked on it. They all signed the draft and submitted it to the Federation Council. The work was not free from disputes. Alternative versions were drawn up. There were minority opinions. In short, it had all the characteristics of in-depth creative work. I had occasion to talk with this group at Morozovka near Moscow, where it was in session, and it even looked as if this point could be renamed, as a result of heated disputes.

On 6 March the Federation Council adopted this draft as a basis, eliminating nine-tenths of the alternative provisions. It was deemed expedient to send the draft to the republics' Supreme Soviets to decide, after discussions, how the Treaty on the Union of Sovereign Republics should subsequently be examined and signed.

From the very first clauses it is stated that this treaty is signed by sovereign states expressing the will of their peoples for a renewal of the Union. For the first time in my experience as a lawyer I have heard it said that a republic is not a state. But no, as we say in the south, it is "very much a state." Incidentally, open the existing USSR Constitution, and you will see in Article 76 that "a Union Republic is a sovereign soviet socialist state that has joined with other soviet republics"... and so forth, throughout the text. So let us go back to the sources more often.

About the Future

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] People are tired—and not only of shortages, the goods famine, and the trials of our daily life. It seems they are even more tired of political passions, uncertainty, the impossibility of planning the family budget. When the long-awaited stability arrives, what lies in store for us?

[Lukyanov] In the next few months the question of prices must be resolved, and wholesale and retail prices balanced. That will enable us to normalize the economy. Storehouses and enterprises, where output is being stockpiled while they wait for the new prices, will soon release these products. After three months, the market will to some degree sort out the supply of goods. But this will not exclude the possibility of a new spiral of inflation. It will be necessary once again to make efforts to stabilize the economic situation. The late Kosygin (and he was a very clever man) used to say that you can carry out a reform like that once in a lifetime. But that is by the way. Then there will be measures not only to promote stabilization, but also to ensure accelerated progress toward the market. By that time we will have adopted the main legislative acts—on the stock exchange, tariffs, customs, small enterprises... Acts have already been adopted on entrepreneurship and the banks. We have no alternative. It is clear that we must move toward a self-regulating economy, doing our best to ensure that the state is far less directly involved in production.

After all, what position were the party and our central organs put in, have you thought about that?

The opposition could criticize, but these organs had to strive day and night to plug the gaps, and at the same time rebuff the opposition's attacks.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] But that's how it is all over the world, Anatoliy Ivanovich—the opposition is there to criticize...

[Lukyanov] Yes, but over there the state, the president, and the authorities are not tied to the economy to the same extent as in our country.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] So is it possible that in this way our opposition has encouraged our central organs to cast off inappropriate functions more rapidly?

[Lukyanov] It did encourage them to do this, and in a very original way. It criticized as hard as it could, and when in a number of cities and republics it came to power, what did it do? Be objective, though! It remained the opposition. Hold rallies—yes, with great pleasure; but as for repairing the sewers, building roads and housing, looking after veterans, schools, and hospitals—no time for that.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] So you think all these problems that have accumulated over the decades can be resolved in one city or rayon individually?

[Lukyanov] Of course not. They can only be resolved as a whole. You can't build Campanella's City of the Sun in Moscow's Oktyabrskiy Rayon.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] So even the opposition was objectively unable radically to change or rectify anything.

[Lukyanov] I watch the opposition quietly and with understanding. The pike is in the river to keep the carp awake. But if you, the opposition, are in power, the cards are in your hands. Show us that you can handle things better. But it doesn't work out that way...

I think sooner or later this infantile disease of drunken democratism will come to an end and everything will fall into a civilized framework. Perhaps without us, perhaps under a different leadership. And maybe we did the most difficult thing—we got society moving, so that progress could begin toward renewal, a self-regulating economy, and more profound democratism. And here I am an optimist.

On the Referendum

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] As 17 March approaches, passions over the approaching all-union referendum are becoming increasingly heated. What is your view of the referendum? How do you assess its political expediency?

[Lukyanov] The aim of the referendum is to strengthen the rule of law in the country, safeguard the citizen's rights regardless of which republic he lives in, and consolidate all guarantees of the equality of peoples and their state formations. It is quite natural for passions to seethe around this very important political event.

Let me remind you that the law adopted by the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies provides for the holding of a nationwide vote on questions that fall within the Union's competence, that is, questions of statewide significance. Is the question of the fate of our Union in its renewed form such a question? The answer is clear: Yes, it is. And the republics should not deny citizens the right to participate in the vote or hamper it.

Furthermore, the paramountcy of citizens' rights and freedoms, which everyone acknowledges, means that it is the citizens who should decide what kind of state they want to live in—a federation of sovereign republics or a conglomeration of appanage principalities. Therefore every citizen, wherever he lives, should be guaranteed the freedom to have his say, the freedom to choose.

Last, the referendum is an act of formulation of the will of millions of people, an act of the people's political consciousness. Its consolidating role lies in this. That is why there is no doubt as to the expediency of holding the referendum. That is why I do not understand, in human terms, why people want to tack on all kinds of preemptive or parallel polls to the nationwide referendum.

People sometimes ask: If the majority of the population of a given republic comes out against the preservation of the Union, will that republic remain within the USSR? Yes, it will. It will, because the question of a union republic's secession from the USSR can only be decided in accordance with the procedure laid down by the 3 April 1990 USSR Law "On the Procedure for Resolving Questions Connected With the Secession of a Union Republic From the USSR." I am not about to expound on this procedure. Anyone who is interested can go back to the source. I will only say that the people of any republic may, through a referendum and by a two-thirds majority of voters, resolve once and for all the question of secession from the USSR. After this a transitional period would, of course, be necessary to arrive at settlements relating to economic, political, humanitarian, legal, and other relations.

That is why—I would like to make it clear once again—the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution adopted 25 February specifically explains that the USSR referendum does not involve changing or consolidating the status of the republics in any way—it relates entirely to the fate of the Union. And in the event that fewer than half the voters in a given republic take part in the vote, the results of that vote will nonetheless be taken into account in summing up the results of the referendum for the Union as a whole.

I believe in the people's wisdom. They will work out whether or not they want the country to disintegrate.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] We are talking about preserving stability in society at all costs and protecting it against civil clashes. At the same time, on 25 February, the Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution permitting the holding of the referendum against the will of the republics' legislatures. Will this not objectively help to exacerbate the tension and confrontation in those republics?

[Lukyanov] Yes, there is a danger of that. In some places the legislatures have already announced that soviets that hold the referendum will be dissolved. In particular, reports to that effect have come in from Moldova. There are threats of criminal proceedings. So does this mean that the Supreme Soviet and Congress of People's Deputies, who adopted the decision to hold the referendum, have no alternative but to swallow this bitter pill and agree to it? What if you look at it through the eyes of the more than 70 million people of nonindigenous nationalities living in union republics? Yet every one of them expects to be protected not by the republic, but by the Union. How can you ignore the letters—not dozens, but thousands of them—that we are receiving from Klaipeda, Daugavpils, the Polish rayons of Lithuania, and northeastern rayons of Estonia? People want to participate in determining the Union's fate. Have we any right to ignore their wish?

Therefore the Supreme Soviet acted very cautiously by deciding that where people themselves want to hold the referendum, they should be given the opportunity. If they do not apply to do so, no one is going to force anyone into it.

But some people want to make the referendum take a different turn. Using your newspaper, among others. In recent days, items have been published in the mass media, signed by certain scholars, political scientists, and commentators, which attempt to substitute for the clearly formulated subject of the referendum the subject of confidence in the "center," the subject of confidence in—let us not beat around the bush—the president. In this way the meaning of the referendum is being displaced, distorted. And I can only describe this as an unscrupulous political and propaganda trick pursuing quite specific goals.

That is to say, a gross substitution of concepts is taking place. Instead of determining the fate of the Union, the aim of the referendum is declared to be a vote of confidence or no confidence in a political line. From the viewpoint of social psychology, this is smart tactics. Attention is deliberately focused on an individual. In just the same way that the 5-percent tax imposed by the USSR Supreme Soviet is deliberately associated solely with the president's name.

True, on 30 December last year IZVESTIYA published the full text of the presidential decree "On the Imposition of a Sales Tax." Later the Supreme Soviet made provision for this tax in the Law "On the Union Budget for 1991." But every cashier, as she stamps the check, says: the president's tax. Is this an accident? No, accidents like that don't happen in politics. Especially since you won't hear it in every city, because they include this tax in the price.

Could There Be New Elections?

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Since the time of the elections of people's deputies in spring 1989, major changes have taken place in society's consciousness and much has been reassessed. There is a widespread view that the present body of deputies is not appropriate to the new level of public awareness, and that new elections should be held without waiting for the expiry of the five-year term. What do you think?

[Lukyanov] I am surprised at the way the question is put. It implies that the situation in the country is changing, new ideas are arising, new problems are emerging, yet the deputies are still the same as they were two years ago. That is, society is moving, but the people's representatives are standing still. But where have you seen any evidence of that? I will venture to assure you that the body of deputies changes, cannot avoid changing, along with society.

And then again, are the deputies divorced from the voters? No. First, the majority of deputies—and quite a large majority—still live and work at their enterprises and institutions. Just as they used to be part of society itself, with all its troubles and worries, so they still are. Second, as a rule even those deputies who work permanently at the USSR Supreme Soviet regularly visit the districts and organizations from which they were elected and maintain contacts with the voters. And they bring to the sessions and Congresses everything that happens in society. And two days ago, on the Supreme Soviet's decision, they once again dispersed to their districts.

So the deputies do not lack a keen perception of life, a high degree of awareness, and civic responsibility, though there are exceptions, of course. The body of deputies does sometimes lack the necessary competence in resolving the most complex problems of life and in preparing state decisions that are beyond reproach both in terms of timeliness and depth of preparation, and in terms of defining a clear program of action. Furthermore immediate new elections and the immediate replacement of all the deputies would also mean losing the experience that was won with such difficulty. Our experience, like that of other countries, shows that in crisis conditions the most correct strategy is to maintain the authority of the existing institutions of state power. This strategy helps to stabilize the situation. But if the voters have serious complaints about individual deputies, they can recall them. True, the new law on recalling deputies has not yet been adopted. But no one has repealed the old one—it is still in force.

And I would like to tell you one thing. The people's deputies who are now in office—at all levels—have to decide perhaps the most dramatic question in our history: the question of radically renewing society without

permitting a social confrontation or a decline toward civil war. That is the main thing. And when it comes to the body of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies, it seems to me that today, now that it has been tempered in debates, politically hardened, and "knocked into shape," it could and should fulfill far more enterprisingly its most important task, a task that is not often noticed by our press—the task of stabilizing society and keeping the revolutionary processes channeled within peaceful banks.

The ice is melting. The spring waters cannot be turned back. But it is up to all of us to ensure that the spring floods do not swamp our young democracy and newly begun reforms.

Political & Social

'Act of Terrorism' Disrupts Flight to Novosibirsk

LD1803072291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0659 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Nadezhda Potapova]

[Text] Sverdlovsk, 18 Mar (TASS)—It was only after eight hours that 343 passengers aboard an Il-86 airliner flying from Moscow to Novosibirsk today could resume their flight after it was interrupted by an act of terrorism.

Fifteen minutes after midnight, when the airliner was flying at a height of 10,100 meters, 300 km to the north of Sverdlovsk, one of the passengers suddenly threw a bottle containing an incendiary mixture in the passenger area. A fire started. The passenger area and the pilot's cabin filled with smoke. The Sverdlovsk air traffic control service ordered the plane to land at the nearest airport. Thirty minutes later the crew, who were wearing oxygen masks, made an emergency landing at Sverdlovsk airport, where emergency services and the transport police of the Sverdlovsk aviation division were waiting on the tarmac. All 343 passengers and 17 crew are safe and sound.

The terrorist has been arrested. He is Y. Volodin, born in 1968, who had been working as a carpenter at the furniture factory in Novokuznetsk. He said that he wanted to destroy the airliner. According to the bodies carrying out the investigation, the criminal was registered at a psychiatric clinic.

The procurator has begun an investigation.

Reports Examine Internal Troops' Role, Situation

Political Chief Interviewed

PM1503164691 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Lieutenant General A. Griyenko, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops Political Directorate, by S. Shevtsov; place and date not given: "Both Stones and Flowers"]

[Text] [Shevtsov] Aleksandr Ivanovich, I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that the internal troops are one of perestroyka's "discoveries." In many ways, the dramatic contemporary political situation has put them in a peculiar light: In the "hot" spots, I have seen some people hurl stones at the soldiers and others shower them with flowers....

[Griyenko] Yes, indeed, the soldiers in the internal troops carry a special burden today. Attitudes toward them are peculiar and contradictory. Some people understand how important it is to defend public order, state buildings, precious freight, and correctional labor institutions, and they remember how internal troops are always on the scene to assist in major accidents and natural disasters. Others seek to depict the soldier as a "chastiser" brandishing a club or an automatic rifle and call without a moment's hesitation for the withdrawal of troops from the "hot" regions.

Perestroyka's dramatic episodes have taken the troops to the crest of political passions. Note that the 15,000-20,000 servicemen on permanent duty in the country's "hot" spots are but a drop in the bucket compared to the total number of troops. The main bulk of our people serve day and night from Sakhalin to Brest, from the Arctic Ocean to Kushka, performing often thankless tasks without which society simply would not survive.

In general, there is no need to remind our officers and soldiers that it is not a matter of peoples and nationalities. But sometimes you cannot help but think that somebody is longing for the soldiers' strong young nerves to snap. Then the opponents of constitutional order would have their long-awaited "trump card." But in Namangan the soldiers knew that their comrades had been killed and burned by the very crowd which stood before them and still they only fired shots into the air. No doubt, many people in the Baltic region today would not be averse to being dealt just such a "trump card," but I am sure that the soldiers' restraint and patience will be fully appreciated by society later, when passions subside.

[Shevtsov] Having adopted a declaration on sovereignty, the leadership of several republics announced that they would be creating their "own" internal troops and forming their own armed detachments. In your opinion, how serious is the threat of the single internal force breaking up and splintering into "national compartments," and how does this tie in with the draft law on internal troops?

[Griyenko] Our view is this: While the Union state exists (and I hope that it will continue into the future) there must be a single multinational internal force professing an interrepublic recruitment and training system. You tell me—in today's explosive situation, is it really feasible to have for example Armenian and Azerbaijani internal troops each equipped with modern hardware and weapons? And purely Moldavian troops in Moldova? How would they treat inhabitants of the Dnestr region or the Gagauz? It seems to me that the restrictive

national armed formations are being set up out of nationalist rather than national interests.

At the recent Congress of USSR People's Deputies, one of the deputies suggested creating an interrepublican internal force on a professional basis. But, you know, today's troops are already "interrepublican": They do not belong to any one republic and at the same time they belong to everyone in the form of the Union.

I repeat that to allow troops now to drift off toward separatist, nationalistically inclined leaders is extremely dangerous. I think that the law on internal troops will dot the "i's" in this sense.

[Shevtsov] Incidentally, Aleksandr Ivanovich, what gave rise to the need to adopt yet another legal act on internal troops when, as we all know, the country's Supreme Soviet already adopted one law in the spring of this year?

[Griyenko] That law was entitled "On the Rights and Duties of Internal Forces in the Defense of Public Order" and concerned, as its title clearly indicates, just one side of the troops' activities. Now we need to adopt another law on internal troops to reflect an extremely broad range of questions—the troops' status in the state system, their tasks, organizational principles (including among others the principle of centralized leadership), ways of recruiting, duties during a state of emergency, the troops' obligations and rights when carrying out different duties, cooperation with the local organs of power, the legal and social protection of servicemen.... All political, social, and economic aspects must be provided for.

To avoid possible mistakes or confusion, the legislators will ratify the law, in all probability, after the republics have adopted the Union treaty. A group of officers from our troops' main directorate has also been working on th draft law, taking due account of the experience of both the troops themselves and analogous foreign formations such as the U.S. National Guard. Not only do the troops themselves need a law on internal troops, but more than anything our society needs it and so does each one of us. Many people justifiably pin their hopes for the restoration of order in our country on the adoption of this act.

[Shevtsov] It is well known that the Russian Supreme Soviet has adopted a resolution which focuses on sending only professional soldiers in the internal troops to places of interethnic conflict, and not servicemen doing their compulsory service. What does the draft law on internal troops say on this score? Are there any "contract soldiers" in the internal troops in general?

[Griyenko] There is a great deal of dilettantism in the debates over a professional army. Discussions are often engaged in by people who do not investigate the problem thoroughly. Right now, every third soldier in the troops is either an officer or a warrant officer. Recently, I visited a unit comprising several thousand warrant officers and men on extended service. They had signed contracts voluntarily and are very highly skilled. Do you not regard them as professional? At the same time, however, the problems facing them when the workload is heavy are well known: low financial rewards (an extended serviceman receives a basic salary of 180 rubles, and a warrant officer receives little more), no accommodation.... Decide, legislators! Then it will be time for further, successive steps.

At the moment, an experiment is being carried out in the Dzerzhinskiy Division. It had been planned to create a subdivision of mercenary soldiers but so far there has been no success at all in recruiting a company. Moreover, many of those who were recruited broke their contracts. Why? A wage of 300-320 rubles a month, persistent problems with accommodation, food, lack of legal protection—none of this entices people to enter danger zones and risk their lives.

While many people are creating a hullabaloo in the press and in legislature: "Let us have a professional army and professional troops!"—to my mind, one line of a reliable resolution would be more use: To allocate enough money to recruit, say, 2,000 contract soldiers. But meanwhile this is still just a storm in a teacup....

[Shevtsov] Aleksandr Ivanovich, the atmosphere in the country remains complex; people are tired of uncertainty and long for stabilization. As a member of the CPSU Central Control Commission, a delegate at the 28th Party Congress, and a political activist, how do you see tomorrow?

[Griyenko] Above all I am an optimist. If we military people become despondent then this will merely complicate an already difficult situation. Come what may, we are obliged to do our duty. As far as my position as a communist and a member of the Central Control Commission is concerned, let me remind you that at the Central Control Commission Presidium's first session I raised the following question for discussion: Who has failed to fulfill party decisions or take measures to implement the decisions of the well-known party Central Committee Plenum on the nationalities question? You know, we communists are largely responsible for the way events developed, especially the republic leaders and the local leaders. Our party's international traditions have clearly been ignored. Of course it is not just a matter of finding and punishing the guilty, but of carefully analyzing mistakes and of taking steps to emerge from the crisis.

Right now we are once again counting the dead and wounded on each side in the Baltic region and in South Ossetia. Who is to blame? The nationalists are doing their evil deeds, because the internationalists had disappeared into the shadows long before. It is as if rejecting a "ceremonial" declaration of friendship means that we must reject educating people in the spirit of friendship. Moreover, it is not only "as if"—for in actual fact, to our general detriment, this has been rejected.... The recent events in the Baltic region and in Georgia showed how far nationalism, separatism, and adventurism can go.

The internal troops will continue to carry out their constitutional duty. That is their mission.

Law, Order Roles Detailed

PM1503170391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 First Edition p 6

[Report by Colonel A. Sanin under the rubric: "After the Briefing": The Law, The Rule of Law, and the Internal Troops"]

[Text] During the past three years USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] internal troops have been constantly giving assistance in the provinces to maintain public order in regions where there is a complex operational situation. They counter the mass criminal behavior of extremist elements and serve as guarantor of the life, health, and dignity of Soviet people. This is particularly noticeable in the elimination of interethnic conflicts.

"Today the internal troops," Major General Ye. Nechayev [not further identified] emphasized at the opening of the briefing, "are the focus of public attention."

This really is the case. In recent years the troops have executed missions in 17 different regions, and in several of them on two, three, or more occasions. There have been Sumgait, Novyy Uzen, Nagorno-Karabakh, Fergana, Abkhazia, Dushanbe, Moldova, Osh Oblast, and Tskhinvali.

The following statistics are a testimony to the effectiveness of the internal troops' actions. Only over the past year, 140,000 people have been detained for various violations of the law; more than 7,000 items of firearms and more than 2,000 explosive devices and a large quantity of ammunition have been confiscated.

The troops do, unfortunately, sustain losses when carrying out their constitutional duty. In settling the interethnic conflict in the Transcaucasus, Central Asia, and other regions of the country 20 ordinary soldiers and noncommissioned officers, a military academy cadet, and nine officers have perished. Four servicemen on compulsory service perished in the town of Namangan. About 1,300 servicemen have been injured or wounded.

As of today internal troops have been enlisted to carry out official duties outside the places of their permanent deployment in seven regions of the country. As before, guard details are appointed daily from among the troops to protect state installations and correctional institutions, to accompany special freights, escort special contingents, and to safeguard the work of the judicial and investigative organs. Thousands of soldiers and noncommissioned officers—and this accounts for about two-thirds of troop numbers—bear arms in combat service and set off on patrol in order to guarantee the normal rhythm of Soviet people's lives.

Ligachev Interviewed on Union's 'Disintegration'

PM1803151991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Mar 91 First Edition p 6

[Unattributed roundup of interviews given to Western media by Soviet figures under the new rubric "Our Own People About Us": "Opinion for Export"]

[Text] "What is happening in the Soviet Union?" That is a question often asked of our compatriots when they travel abroad. Foreign correspondents accredited in Moscow also have their hands full. We have been extremely successful in exporting opinions, which sometimes border on fiction about our affairs. Sometimes you feel ashamed at the revelations you hear, other times you can see that a person is thinking straight and not acting against his conscience.

Under our new rubric we are going to publish extracts from speeches, statements, and interviews given to foreign mass media by people who are well known in our country and others who are not so well known. You must form your own opinion about what they have to say.

AFP (France): According to Yegor Ligachev in an interview with the French information agency GAMMA, President Mikhail Gorbachev has told him that the disintegration of the Soviet Union would be "a personal tragedy" for him.

"He once said to me: 'Yegor, if the Soviet Union were to disintegrate, it would be a personal tragedy for me,'" Ligachev said in his interview.

"He realizes that we have reached the point where people are asking themselves the question: 'Should the Soviet Union exist or not?' He has been forced to take a clear, definite stand. The disintegration of the Soviet Union has become obvious," said Ligachev, who was second in command in the CPSU for several years and is now an ordinary deputy and a member of the conservative "Soyuz" group. He turned up of his own accord at the foreign information agency's correspondents' center in order to give this interview.

"You could say that Gorbachev has now defined his stand. He has finally realized that it is a question of whether the Soviet Union is going to continue to exist or not. The dividing line runs between supporters and opponents of the socialist path. If the latter were to prevail, we would be pushed in the direction of bourgeois parliamentarianism and the whole of our society would be transformed on the basis of private ownership," Ligachev said.

He believes that this disintegration must be resisted "exclusively by political methods recognized in a democratic state."

"I believe we can stop the process of the Soviet Union's disintegration by political means."

Ligachev still believes that only the CPSU is capable of extricating the country from crisis and emphasizes that the 17 March referendum on the USSR's future "will be a most serious test for the party."

As far as Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin is concerned, Ligachev said that he "considers him to be a big political gambler. His words about a dictatorship are amazing, to say the least. I know him well and, in my opinion, he is the one with dictatorial qualities."

BBC (Britain): Following a meeting with Prime Minister Major at the British Embassy, former Russian Finance Minister Boris Fedorov said in an interview:

"Major was interested in the state of our economy—particularly in the fate of our reforms—and also in what is really happening in the country, and relations between the republics and the center.... My statements were fairly optimistic about the mid-term future, because I believe that hysterics should always be avoided. This country will not disappear, whoever is here. Reform will have to continue—it is another matter that it will be a case of drifting rather than making a breakthrough and a systematic entry into the market system. It is all going to be rather disorderly and chaotic."

Correspondent: Do you know why Major did not have a meeting with Yeltsin?

Fedorov: It is hard to say, but, all things considered, he acted very sensibly. As far as I am aware, Russia is not a legal entity in international law. It could have been interpreted by some of our political figures as interference or an attempt to influence a conflict that has now reached its climax. I think that, from the point of view of circumspection, it was the right decision to make: So that all concerned are given as few trump cards as possible.

IL GIORNO (Italy): Mikhail Poltoranin, Boris Yeltsin's right-hand man and Russian press minister, has subjected USSR President Gorbachev to devastating criticism. He believes that civil war is now inevitable and that there is an enormous risk of nuclear weapons being used in such a war.

Poltoranin also criticizes Western journalists who give a false picture of Gorbachev, and expresses his opinions with complete candour. He explains why compromise between progressives and the initiator of perestroyka is now impossible. In his interview he paints a chilling picture which, even allowing for the subjectivity of his views, cannot fail to cause deep concern.

Question: The progressives accuse Gorbachev of an excessive swing to the right. What do you think is the explanation for this change of course?

Answer: It has always been so. His course has essentially remained unchanged. I joined his "team" in 1985. We—a group of experts—met at what used to be Zhdanov's dacha to draw up his new political program. We studied the situation and came to the conclusion that, if nothing changed, the country would collapse in six months. The country did not have the economic resources necessary to implement radical changes, however. Western credit was absolutely vital. In order to secure this credit, Gorbachev was forced to slightly turn the tap of liberalization, although he had no intention of going any further than outwardly liberalizing Bolshevism.

Question: But people are also concerned by some aspects of Yeltsin's behavior, which seem excessively authoritarian. Who can guarantee that he, too, will not go back on his word and move toward totalitarianism?

Answer: You Western journalists are not very observant. You cannot distinguish between a devil and an angel. A devil covers his head with a beautiful scarf and you cannot see the pair of horns beneath. Gorbachev seems good natured but in actual fact he is a partocrat who has been through the school of demagoguery, where people learn to be obliging if necessary. Yeltsin is not authoritarian, although he is a firm man with a firm tone. He is not one of those people who like to speak in a honeyed voice.

Shevardnadze: Threat of Dictatorship Remains

PM1503105091 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 13 Mar 91 p 5

[Report on news conference with former Foreign Minister Edvard Shevardnadze on 12 March in Moscow by Marcello Villari: "'Threat of Dictatorship Hangs Over the New USSR'"]

[Text] Moscow—Edvard Shevardnadze leaves for Italy today: It will be his first visit abroad since his resignation as foreign minister. It is a private visit, on the invitation of Lucarini, who are publishing his book. On 15 March he will meet with [Prime Minister] Andreotti and the pope, but also with [Democratic Party of the Left Secretary] Achille Occhetto. The following day he will leave for Moscow, because he is due to meet with Baker, at Gorbachev's invitation. He will, however, have time to appear on the "Samarcanda" television program. Yesterday he decided to meet with Italian journalists here in Moscow. Here are his answers to the questions that we put to him.

[L'UNITA] How do you assess the results of the Gulf war?

[Shevardnadze] First, I want to point out that I forecast when this war would end. You may not have noticed. At the beginning of February I said that the war would be over within a month, because such a war could not last long. I believe that world civilization has just passed a very tough test and that it has has done so with dignity. Now more favorable conditions are emerging for building a new political order, though of course other problems are emerging: how to move forward, how to

build relations between the Middle Eastern states in order to prevent the future emergence of conflict situations.

[L'UNITA] In Belorussia Gorbachev has put forward the idea of neocentrism,. Could this formula provide a solution?

[Shevardnadze] What the president said relates basically to tactics. As far as strategy is concerned, the policy for the regeneration of interethnic relations and the federation, for the democratization of society—in other words, for the building of a new country—must remain. There is no other way.

[L'UNITA] In the Congress of Deputies you reproached the democrats for their passiveness. Now Yeltsin's latest speech powerfully reveals an open battle between the democrats and the center. How do you assess these latest events?

[Shevardnadze] I believe that since the fourth Congress of Deputies session major changes have taken place in the direction of growth, activism, organization, and combativeness. But, as in any movement, exaggerations can occur, and we are seeing some of these. I do not believe that war should be declared on the democratic forces or the conservatives; I do not believe there should be a direct battle. Now the main task—of the democrats, first and foremost—remains to strengthen chiefly the democratic forces but also the sound forces that exist even among the conservatives.

[L'UNITA] President Gorbachev has said that detente is fragile. Why?

[Shevardnadze] When we say that the first buds of a new order in international relations have emerged, this of course implies that they are still fragile. Nevertheless I must say that a very solid foundation for the new world order has been laid. For instance, U.S-USSR relations are based on new principles, and this is already an established fact; we have moved on from confrontation and contraposition—in the military field, too—to interaction and partnership. Is this not much? We have reached a truly historic achievement. Even a few years ago it was difficult to predict these new relations between East and West, changes in the Asian area, the normalization of relations between the USSR and China. The prospects are reassuring, even though some forces want the world community to return to the old orders.

[L'UNITA] When you resigned you said that there was a threat of a dictatorship. Now, three months on, is the dictatorship nearer or further away?

[Shevardnadze] The danger has not been eliminated. As you will have noticed, when Gorbachev spoke in Minsk (in Belorussia) he stated loud and clear, unequivocally, that the country is threatened by chaos unless it overcomes the difficulties in interethnic matters and in the economy. So if this is a possibility, what solution to the chaos can be envisaged? Of course, one possibility—perhaps the most likely—is the advent of a dictator, a hard-liner. So I was right to warn about this possibility.

[L'UNITA] Are you still working on the START agreement?

[Shevardnadze] I believe that the agreement is basically ready. During the past year all the basic problems have been resolved. I believe that during Secretary of State Baker's next visit to Moscow there is a chance of agreeing on the remaining technical points, too.

[L'UNITA] Is there an element of truth in the statements by certain Soviet leaders, such as Prime Minister Pavlov or KGB Chairman Kryuchkov, that attempts are being made from outside to destabilize Soviet society?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, perhaps we could speak of an element of truth, because there are "hawks" in all countries, but on the whole, if we are talking about the feelings of the people and of reasonable politicians—who constitute the vast majority—I have no doubt that the western states and people very much want perestroyka and democratization to succeed.

[L'UNITA] Has Gorbachev offered you any other leadership posts since your resignation?

[Shevardnadze] I have received suggestions. If I had accepted, I would have assumed a fairly senior position. But Mikhail Sergeyevich accepted my arguments about the inappropriateness of my accepting, following my statement.

Zagladin on 'Explosion in Political Activity'

LD1803223291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2100 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] Eleven thousand political parties and movements are currently in existence in the Soviet Union and 1,500 of them aspire to a nationwide role. This statement by Zagladin, USSR presidential adviser on international issues, is cited by the Novosti agency. In Zagladin's view such an explosion in political activity inevitably accompanies a transfer from totalitarianism to democracy.

Decree Banning Armed Formations Viewed

LD1503210591 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Recently here everybody loves to speak—and not without the help of the mass media—about the fact that presidential decrees are not being implemented at all, or are being implemented badly. Is this so? Well, let us touch on, for example, the well-known presidential decree forbidding the creation of armed formations. We have invited into the studio Yuriy Vladimirovich Golik, chairman of the USSR

president's committee on coordinating the activities of the bodies of law and order.

So, is this presidential decree effective?

[Golik] It is effective. On the whole it is one of those decrees which is the cause of all kinds of arguments flaring up and they are still not quieting down. I can simply say that since the adoption of this decree around 30,000 firearms have been confiscated, the majority of them rifles which were held illegally by our citizens.

Also around four tons of explosive substances have been confiscated and almost three million pieces of ammunition for this weaponry. Around 100 formations have also been disbanded, the general number of which is around 6,000 people. Around 400, more than 400 criminal cases have been instigated on these facts. Around 100 people have been arrested and 50 people have already been sentenced.

Unfortunately major defects in storing weaponry at enterprises have come to light. Because of this around 400,000 firearms have been removed from around 40,000 enterprises and organizations and put into military depots.

[Announcer] These are terrible figures. But evidently impressive work has been carried out. How does it break down by republic?

[Golik] Very unevenly. Around 80 percent of the arms confiscated are from the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, and Kazakhstan. The Baltic republics and the Transcaucasian republics have almost completely blocked the implementation of this decree. This on the whole has an effect on our citizens and not on the republics or the leaders of these republics. Over this period of time 756 of our citizens and 98 workers of the law and order bodies have died. More than 4,000 people have been injured in shootings.

[Announcer] Unfortunately sad news keeps coming in. In particular today we received a report from South Ossetia that blood is being spilled again, there are more deaths.

[Golik] Yes, in Tskhinvali alone in March, in the first week of March, almost 200 firearm barrels were confiscated. This can in no way have a positive effect in establishing order and calm in our common home.

Journal Lists Dec-Feb Presidential Decrees

91UN1102A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 11, Mar 91 p 1

["Ukases Issued by the USSR President"]

[Text] **At the request of our readers, we continue the list of the most important decrees of the USSR president, which ARGUMENTY I FAKTY began publishing in issues No 39 and 50 in 1990.**

11 December 1990 On adopting Regulations on the Special Commission to verify the objectivity and completeness of investigations into the causes of death and injuries of servicemen and military construction personnel in peacetime.

14 December On measures to prevent the disorganization of production due to the unsatisfactory status of concluding economic contracts for product delivery in 1991.

22 December On measures to normalize the situation in the Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

29 December On creating off-budget economic stabilization funds in 1991.
On the introduction of the sales tax.

5 January 1991 On priority tasks in the implementation of land reform.

7 January On some legislative acts adopted in December 1990 in the Georgian SSR.

10 January On urgent measures to improve the foodstuffs situation in 1991.

11 January On confirming General Regulations on Military-Political Organs.

22 January On discontinuing the acceptance of USSR Gosbank [State Bank] 1961 issue banknotes of 50-ruble and 100-ruble denominations, and on restricting cash withdrawals from citizens' deposits.

23 January On streamlining the management of the city of Moscow.

26 January On measures to ensure the struggle against economic sabotage and other crimes in the economic sphere.

29 January On organizing the Committee for Coordinating the Operations of Law-Enforcement Organs of the USSR president.
On cooperation between the militia and units of the USSR Armed Forces in maintaining legal order and fighting crime.

4 February On measures to step up the struggle against the most dangerous crimes and their organized forms.

5 February On resolutions of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Council, dated 16 and 18 January, on holding a poll of the citizens of the republic.

8 February On additional measures to perpetuate the memory of Soviet citizens who died defending the Motherland in the pre-war years and during the Great Patriotic War, as well as those who performed international duty.
On creating the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company.

14 February On priority measures to ensure the socio-economic protection of literature and art personalities under the conditions of switching to market relations.

Economic

Gorbachev's Comments To Economists

PM1803191591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 91 First Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report on M.S. Gorbachev meeting with "leading economists" in the Kremlin 16 March: "A Scientific Basis for the Government Program"]

[Excerpts] Not exceptional circumstances, but the continuation of a tradition—that was the reason given for M.S. Gorbachev's latest meeting with the country's leading economists. The meeting took place 16 March in the Kremlin. Those taking part included prominent scientists, state and public figures, members of the Cabinet of Ministers, parliamentarians, representatives of central economic departments, and workers in sectors of the national economy.

Opening the meeting, M.S. Gorbachev noted: Its aim is to determine how to give the reforms a new dynamism, how the next steps should be structured and what priorities should be attached to them, and what guidelines should be offered in the context of today's situation, when crisis phenomena are on the increase in society, and first and foremost in the sphere of the economy. In short, as work on the government program is completed, there is a need once again to synchronize our watches and compare opinions and positions.

The present leadership is firmly committed to the course of reforms and advocates their resolute continuation, the president stressed. I must say this in the light of the fact that in the press, scholarly literature, and political debates today the following view has become rather widespread: Perestroyka has failed, and has led the country into an impasse. There is also a theory that the leadership has abandoned its course and shifted to the right.

So this is an invitation to a meeting not to bury perestroyka and look for "proof" of its death, but to engage in serious discussion. Here it is assumed that the main question—where are we going?—is, for us, already decided.

In characterizing the present situation in the economy I proceed from the assumption that the participants in the meeting are in possession of the information, but would like to express views, however general, on the subject. The disintegration of economic links continues, under the influence of certain factors. Despite the fact that an economic agreement was signed at the beginning of the year, as well as an agreement on food supply questions, and attempts have been made to organize interrepublic links, nonetheless the process of disintegration of economic links has not been halted. This is the greatest threat to the country, to the satisfaction of its urgent needs, to say nothing of its progress along the path of transformations.

The situation is all the more serious in that certain political forces are well and truly exploiting this situation. For us, today's difficulties provide the impetus to change the state of affairs for the better, but for opposition forces they provide arguments to support their criticism of the present leadership. Therefore for them the main viewpoint is: "The worse things get, the better." That is the key to understanding the policy that the leadership and the opposition forces pursue.

We are continuing to seek ways of preventing the further disintegration of economic links and forming new structures. This is no easy work. Two approaches have come into conflict here—the first could be called the "Gossnab" [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] approach, that is, it proposes that we operate exclusively on the basis of the state order; the second proposes that we operate through the establishment of direct links by means of the conclusion of appropriate contacts. We find ourselves in what you could call a "tug-of-war" situation. The supporters of these approaches want to prove to each other that it is impossible to maintain links by any other means or in any other form than those that they themselves propose. But often both sides' arguments have been based not on serious economic or political analysis, but simply on passions.

In the end life has revealed that both positions are one-sided, and the answer arrived at by everyone at the recent Cabinet of Ministers session, where the course of fulfillment of economic agreements was examined, is this: an organic combination of the activity of supply organs and work to implement interrepublic links.

Joint work is in progress today by the center, the republics, and the Cabinet of Ministers. The situation in the basic sectors, first and foremost the coal industry, has been examined. Urgent questions of the financial position of sectors and problems of the material and technical base have been resolved. But as I said, the situation is not improving, but deteriorating. The decline in production has reached a worrying scale: in two months, a 10-percent fall in national income, a 4.5-percent decline in industry, and a 13-percent decline in agriculture. In addition to the disintegration of economic links associated largely with destructive processes in the Union, the export situation also had an adverse effect here. Instead of 125 million tonnes of oil, we were able to allocate only 60 million tonnes for sale, and that means a loss of foreign currency and a corresponding reduction in import purchases, that could only affect output in light industry, the food industry, and machine building. Overall results are also affected by the decline in production in the defense sector of industry, accounting for a huge proportion of our economy.

Extreme views exist on how to find a way out of this situation, but a sound, sensible approach must be formulated—we cannot resort to extreme measures. Such measures would bring back the diktat of the edict system in an even worse form, that is absolutely clear.

We have begun to normalize the country's financial economy on the basis of the Economic Agreement and the new budget, notable for the fact that it makes provision for very important changes in the direction of cutting expenditure. In particular, expenditure on defense and capital construction have been cut. But at the same time it is also necessary to seek sources of finance to cover expenditure arising from urgent social programs and decisions of the Supreme Soviet.

S.S. Shatalin, in one of his speeches, gave this advice: "Gorbachev should either summon up his courage and stand his ground, or quit, and leave the field clear for someone courageous." But it transpires that all this courage lies in stopping all subsidies in industry and agriculture, cutting expenditure on the defense sector by roughly half, and so forth. Well, if that was possible, it would be just great. I don't think there is anyone in the country today who could do that without bringing about the total collapse of the economy, I can assure you.

Please talk about it, think about it, put forward your proposals. What should the tactics be? What amendments should be made to our practical activity? This concerns the sphere of production, economic links, the consumer market, the country's financial economy, foreign economic relations, and, of course, the functioning of the organs of power both at the center and at republic level.

There was one more factor that prompted the holding of this meeting.

My observations of the developing situation in Eastern Europe and the situation in Brazil and Spain, that is, those who have recently traveled the path of modernization, and my recent very interesting conversations with Turkish President T. Ozal prompt me to draw your attention to the need to make use of those countries' experience.

Look at the East European countries. According to them, they were sick and tired of our model. But—here is the paradox—today they are knocking more and more insistently at our doors and windows. Not only because they are short of something or other, but also because they have a feeling that something real, something that existed, has been destroyed. Whether it was good or bad, at least it existed! And it must be reckoned with, by major economists and especially by politicians. It is no accident that now they are all in favor of dialogue and debate.

They are turning to us increasingly frequently with proposals for cooperation. And this in spite of the fact that a year ago they were telling us that they don't need us, that they can tackle their problems better with the West. When it comes to making decisions in the economic sphere, such vacillations are highly dangerous.

Of course, we are keen to revive and renew ties, and we are not turning away from our neighbors. Especially in view of the fact that we lived together so many years and our economies were oriented toward each other. That has to be taken into account. But the time has come to build new relations without euphoria, on the basis of strict economic calculations and mutual benefit, and then we will like each other better.

Another example is Germany. It is a strong state from every standpoint—economy, politics, science, social situation—and it has huge reserves in finance, technology, discipline, knowledge of modern methods of organization, and the application of these methods. But even there people are now saying that they miscalculated. They thought that they could solve all problems on the territory of the former GDR immediately, but things did not work out that way. The result is a 20-percent drop in the economy last year, and 20 percent forecast for this year. It is forecast that 6 million of the 16-million-strong population will be unemployed. Note, almost all the population's income in eastern Germany will go to pay for goods produced in the developed West. It is considered inexpedient to invest in the economy of the former GDR—that, incidentally, was one of the top 10 developed industrial countries—because of the state of its fixed capital, the backwardness of its technology, and so forth. As a result, many women, for instance, travel dozens of kilometers to make a living, because there is no work at home. This is becoming more frequent. Incidentally, Chancellor Kohl proposed that we retain our former links and expressed readiness to grant loans to keep these production facilities afloat. As we can see, the problem of how to halt the recession and maintain the level of production has now arisen even in Germany.

I have been following events in Brazil with interest. I met with the president—a young and very vigorous person—last spring. He set out the program for improving his country's economy.

About six weeks ago I learned that he had already implemented many of the measures we are planning to implement—there is strict control over spending by enterprises and the population, a thoroughgoing [glubokaya] privatization program, and the country is open to foreign capital. IZVESTIYA recently published an article showing that the planned change in the state of affairs had not taken place, everyone is now waiting to see what will happen. So foreign experience needs to be thought about.

But it is also important not to become divorced from our own history, traditions, and real conditions.

I recently talked with J. Baker during his visit. The U.S. secretary of state said: I got the impression that you have either changed track or are headed for a different destination. I replied: Don't look for those who have already abandoned their plans, that is not the idea. Remember

our conversation in early spring, when the foreign ministers initialed the German unification treaty. At a lunch in their honor talk turned to the economy. All six participants in the Moscow meeting exchanged opinions, and each one put forward his special view of the paths of development. What can be said about our country, can we really mechanically adopt someone else's model here? It will not work. Our work will die and the country will die if we fail to see or take into account this specific vast area of ours—the only such area in the world. Add to this the specific situation regarding all the changes in the Union, the relationship between the center, local level, and the republics, and the transition to the market. In short, there can be no simple approach. There will be stages—successive and dynamic stages—before we reach the high road.

Taking account of the experience of countries undergoing similar processes, we must make a special study of the problem of structural policy under the conditions of transition to the market, for without it we cannot count on long-term reliable success. We have started to implement such a policy but, quite frankly, it is getting nowhere fast. And this is impermissible, because we must use structural policy and conversion to position the defense sector to address the goals we have set ourselves. This is a question that simply cries out to be resolved.

In this connection I want to support the ideas and views recently expressed by Yu.V. Yaremenko.

I once said that hundreds of states operate in market-economy conditions, but only about a couple of dozen have made a success of it. This has happened in those places where a purposeful policy has been implemented, and where success in assimilating new technology goes hand in hand with a market which provides powerful incentives for the producer. Some people think that a real market will appear and force people to compete and seek ways to cut costs, and that then we will save on resources and produce quality goods. All this is true. But I think that excessive emphasis on this could lead to incorrect conclusions not only about approaches but also about practical activity. After all, more than half of all centralized funds in Japan are channeled into scientific and technical progress and fundamental research. The major companies act like small states in this sense. And nobody tries by means of simple cooperation to make parts for Toyota in their backyard—everything is decided at state level or at the center by the powerful corporations' leading organs.

Despite all our current difficulties we must take all this into account. And, returning to the situation in which we find ourselves—and it is not getting any easier—I want to emphasize that the situation in the country requires that we think productively about the most acute issues and provide constructive and absolutely realistic advice for the government. [passage omitted]

M.S. Gorbachev spoke in conclusion. I think that this has been a good brainstorming session, he said, summing up the results of the meeting. We need to build up our knowledge and intensify our research in all main areas. Everyone associated with the work to reform the economy feels an enormous need for this.

We need to step up the element of constructiveness in discussing these issues in scientific organizations, the press, and at various conferences. Unfortunately, populism and politicking have held sway recently, and many press articles and speeches have been so lightweight that it is quite useless even to read them.

We now need to flesh out our course and our kind of baseline program that in the current situation would answer the question of what we are going to do in the months ahead. The people no longer accept general thoughts about the roots of distortions. They will still be felt for some time. People are saying: This is all interesting but where are the decisions which would change the situation for the better in the very near future?

It is particularly important now not to permit any collapses [obvaly] in production. This is a political as well as an economic task. People should have work and an income. Production should make a profit and provide a basis for shaping the Union, republic, and local budgets and for solving socioeconomic problems. Within the cabinet framework we have now created a standing group headed by V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, first deputy prime minister, to maintain economic ties—or, figuratively speaking, to keep our economy afloat. Republic first deputies have been seconded by their government leaders to jointly organize this work, to pool the republics' efforts, and to keep control [uderzhaniye] of the situation.

M.S. Gorbachev expressed the intention to return to the conversion program, noting that nobody is satisfied with it at the moment. The economy, structurally distorted by military production, is our big problem, he said. But the military sector of production affords us a huge opportunity—we need only make sensible use of it. We cannot fail to see the huge opportunities in this area: highly skilled cadres, superb equipment, and modern technology. The complex can produce consumer goods and equipment for civil machine building, the light and food industries, the countryside, and the services sphere. The sphere devoted to the processing, storage, and transportation of agricultural produce has a particularly acute need for the military-industrial complex' help. After all, if everything was harvested, transported, stored, and processed without losses we would obtain 30 percent more produce without increasing the harvest! We process one-and-a-half times less end product per liveweight tonne of meat than other countries. What a colossal reserve that is!

Stressing the need to develop small and medium businesses, the president pointed to the importance of creating the conditions for this and improving the legal base. It turns out that people work at the margins of the law and sometimes circumvent it, he said. We need to

regulate a great deal to prevent enterprising people from breaking the law, and we must adjust the tax system.

Ending the conversation, M.S. Gorbachev stressed that a lot of what he had heard was just individual bright ideas that have yet be integrated as a consistent system of measures—so the main work still lies ahead. The meeting convinces us yet again that time requires clearly calculated decisions, and we are no longer able to delay or to get things wrong.

Meeting Overview

PM1903111591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 91 Second Edition pp 1,2

[TASS report: "Specific Measures and Actions for the Economy"]

[Text] The shaping of a specific program of practical action in the economic sphere—that was the description of the subject matter at the latest meeting between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and the country's leading economists. It was held at the Kremlin 16 March. Taking part in it were prominent academics, statesmen, public figures, members of the Cabinet of Ministers, representatives of central economic departments, and workers in national economic sectors.

Opening the meeting, M.S. Gorbachev noted: The aim of today's meeting with academics is to determine how to bring a new dynamic to the reforms, how to establish our priorities, and what our next steps should be in today's difficult situation. We need to approve approaches yet again and compare our opinions and positions because the Cabinet of Ministers will soon submit its action program for the immediate future to the Supreme Soviet.

Two views feeding off each other are currently quite widespread in the press, scientific literature, and political debates. The first is that perestroyka has failed and led the country into a dead end, and that therefore we need to turn back as quickly as possible. The other is that the leadership has abandoned its course and is under the thumb of extreme conservative forces—in other words, it is curtailing perestroyka, and it has to be saved.

I would like to stress quite clearly that the current leadership is firmly committed to its chosen course of implementing fundamental reforms and the transition to the market, and advocates their resolute continuation.

I am proceeding on the basis that the participants in this meeting are well informed, and therefore I will merely state a few general assessments of the economic situation. The most alarming thing, in my view, is the continuing disintegration of economic ties. Despite the fact that at the start of the year an economic agreement was signed between the republics along with an agreement on food supplies, this process has not been halted. Hence the slump in production, which poses a major threat to the country, to the satisfaction of people's most urgent demands, and, consequently, to progress down the road of transformations. Industrial production has fallen by 4.5 percent in two months, while the corresponding figure for purchases of livestock products is 13 percent.

The government, together with republic organs of power, is dealing with this question. Two approaches have clashed here. The first is to act exclusively on the basis of state orders, and the second is to solve problems by establishing ties between republics. The supporters of these approaches are trying to prove to each other that it is impossible to preserve ties using any methods other than those which they propose. But both sets of positions are often based on personal preference rather than on serious economic or political analysis, and are one-sided. The only correct path now is to organically combine supply organs' activity with the persistent work to implement interrepublic ties and to organize direct ties at all levels.

The situation in the financial sphere remains complex. We have started solving the questions of normalizing the country's finances on the basis of an economic agreement and a new budget. It envisages very important changes along the lines of spending cuts. In particular, spending on defense and capital construction has been reduced, while spending on the implementation of the urgent social programs adopted by the Supreme Soviet has been increased. Unfortunately, the income side of the budget has shown a substantial shortfall because of the unfavorable economic dynamic and—let me be frank—because of illegal separatist actions. This creates additional financial difficulties.

The reduction in production has been caused to a considerable extent by the unfavorable situation in foreign trade. Instead of 125 millions tonnes of oil we managed to set aside only 60 million tonnes for sale—this means a loss of foreign exchange and a corresponding reduction in import purchases, including of a number of materials for the light and food industries. The overall figures for production dynamics have also been affected by the reduction in the volume of defense-sector output.

Various views have been aired about how we should act in this situation. These include extreme and hasty views, but we must elaborate a healthy, balanced approach which will really lead us to success. Extreme measures will only lead to a revival of the diktat of the command system in its worst form.

Please talk about it, think about it, put forward your proposals. What should the tactics be? What amendments should be made to our practical activity? This concerns the sphere of production, economic links, the consumer market, the country's financial economy, foreign economic relations, and, of course, the functioning of the organs of power both at the center and at republic level.

There was one more factor that prompted the holding of this meeting. My observations of the developing situation in East Europe and the situation in Brazil and Spain, that is, those who have recently traveled the path of modernization. My recent very interesting conversations with Turkey's President Ozal prompt me to draw your attention to the need to make more attentive use of other countries' experience and to the impermissibility of there being any ignorance concerning the realities that have come about over the years and decades.

Look at the East European countries. Only a year ago one could hear people say that they intended to solve their problems with the West's help. Today they are knocking at our door more persistently. Not only because they lack raw materials but also because the living socioeconomic fabric that existed there is in danger of rupturing. Needless to say, we will not turn our backs on our neighbors, all the more so as we have lived together for many years and geared our economies to each other. But relations will have to be built in a new way—without ideological euphoria, without political voluntarism, and on the basis of strict economic calculation and mutual advantage.

The experience of the full and accelerated transition to the market in the eastern laender of united Germany—a powerful state with huge reserves in the sphere of the economy, politics, science, and finances and distinguished by superb knowledge of modern methods of organization and management—is highly instructive. But even there it has not proved possible to solve all problems straightaway without major upheavals. There has been a major economic recession accompanied by increased unemployment and other social consequences.

Needless to say, our country differs from its neighbors both in the scale and the diversity of its conditions and traditions. But that is all the more reason why we need to consider, analyze, and take account of other countries' experience.

I would also like to draw your attention to the problems of structural policy under the conditions of transition to the market. Without such a policy we cannot count on long-term reliable success. We have started implementing a new structural policy, but so far, to be frank, things have been getting nowhere fast. The practical implementation of conversion, aimed at positioning the defense sector to address the national economy's needs and—above all—social goals, is of particularly great importance.

Hundreds of states live under market-economy conditions, but only a couple of dozen have made a success of it. Most of these have one important feature—they have implemented and are implementing a purposeful state science and technology policy. In Japan, for instance, huge amounts of funds are channeled on a centralized basis by the state and major corporations into fundamental science and R&D. The state-backed development and assimilation of the latest technology goes hand in hand with a market providing powerful incentives for the producer. For all our current difficulties we must take account of this experience too if we want to create a powerful modern economy rather than some kind of banana-republic market.

Returning to the aims of our meeting, I would like to stress once again that the situation demands that we all think productively about the most important and acute questions of the country's economic development.

We must not succumb to panic or despair. This was how S.S. Alekseyev, chairman of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, began the debate. These words set the tone, as it were: Notwithstanding the crisis nature of the situation, we must not lose our heads, we must soberly analyze the situation and seek, formulate, and practically implement measures to extricate ourselves from the crisis.

Switching from an extremely state-run, monopolized, bureaucratic economic system to a free market economy is an incredibly complex process, the committee chairman continued. We therefore need to introduce into the public consciousness elements of tranquillity and wisdom. And make progress by way of specific measures the speaker suggested. First, that all resources be channeled into agriculture in an endeavor to drastically change the situation in this sphere. And that the transformations started there be resolutely continued: farms transferred to the lease, small cooperatives set up, and private farming [fermerstvo] developed. The intention is to effect denationalization via leasing at the initial stage. Leasing is the school that prepares labor collectives for real autonomous activity as commodity producers. The restoration of the state order as an administrative institution—not in full, covering an enterprise's entire capacity, but, say, 80 percent—was mentioned as another measure. The speaker also advocated setting up commodity exchanges.

Academician M.L. Bronshteyn from Estonia voiced the conviction that there will be no economic recovery or transition to the market as long as there is confrontation between the center and the republics. There must be an interval between an economic treaty and a political treaty to overcome this confrontation since, if the economy continues to collapse, to use the speaker's expression, the future political union will also be killed off. There must be a common economic space, the academician said. As for politics, if some of the republics sign the Union Treaty on a federative basis, some on a confederative basis, and others on the basis of special treaty relations, there should be no fear of this.

Doctor of Economic Sciences O.R. Latsis, first deputy editor in chief of the CPSU Central Committee journal KOMMUNIST, advocated a speedy transition to the market. Indecisiveness harbors great problems, he pointed out. At the same time he emphasized that the transition should be free of adventurism and should be guided and the shock absorbed as far as possible by all

conceivable economic means; people must be aware of the kind of processes that they will have to endure, processes that are inevitable given the unprecedented switch from a planned distribution economy to a market economy.

The speaker drew particular attention to the fact that "strike blackmail" is the greatest danger threatening us today. People are demanding wage increases not because more output has been produced, but because the government, unable to resist blackmail, increased wages at a neighboring enterprise yesterday—a move that bears no relation to reality.

O.R. Latsis' said that the sumptuous stores in the West deceive a Soviet visitor who has grown up in a nonmarket system rather than explain to him the essence of the market. To understand a market economy, you have to live in the West and not only spend but also earn money there, O.R. Latsis said.

Academician A.A. Nikonov, president of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, noted that agriculture should be given priority and argued that land reform should not be held back.

He then mentioned the need to make fuller use of the raw materials we produce. It is a question—for the umpteenth time now (!)—of a lack warehouses, refrigeration facilities, and stores.

V.A. Martynov, director of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, ranked the task of improving the country's financial position as the top priority. An economically highly dangerous "fiscal system pumping money into circulation" is now developing in our country. This system does not stimulate production.

Speaking of the need to close the gap between state prices and black-market prices, he cited the example of Austria and Japan, where it was decided at the time to even use inflation to reduce this difference.

Broaching the subject of privatization, the academic said that there should be clear positions on this. We must not rush to hand out things for free, we'll ruin the economy. In his opinion, the experience of issuing shares in enterprises' property is very important.

Academician N.Ya. Petrakov of the USSR Academy of Sciences stressed that politics should not rush ahead of the economy but should result from and be subordinate to it. We have destroyed our economy to the glory of politics, he said.

His speech did not duck agrarian topics either. Speaking about reform in the agrarian sector, he called for everything that is of use to be done, without concern for what the form of ownership is called.

The academic backed his Estonian colleague M.L. Bronshteyn on the question of the republics' economic union.

Professor V.P. Nesterenko, dean of the economics department at Kiev University, drew attention to the fact that the state sector is still the basis of our economy and expressed regret that there is no serious program with regard to that sector in the country.

In the guise of privatization, state-owned facilities are in practice increasingly being plundered, on the one hand, and many new forms of economic management are parasitically feeding off the state sector of the economy, on the other. I support the new forms, the professor said, but on condition that they increase new wealth and do not merely redistribute it in their own favor.

When discussing the programs one cannot forget the real management of economic life, that cannot stand still for a single day and demands autonomous regulation. Academician L.I. Abalkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the Economy, drew attention to that point in his speech. He said that the prime need is to highlight the priority tasks of the activity of local executive organs of power.

We did not have a well-considered and effective mechanism for the management of the economic reform process and all its aspects, the academics continued, nor do we have one today. The experience of countries that have conducted reforms shows that such specialized structures were endowed with the highest powers. He proposed that such an organ in our country be headed by the chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers and that it include the leaders of the republics' governments.

Academician V.V. Zhurkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute, urged that while fully respecting the global plans for overcoming the crisis one should not forget partial measures. As one such measure he proposed that the USSR join the EEC. The other proposals included the need to pay greater attention to the production of semi-finished food goods and to create interlinked "center-republic" repair and construction materials programs.

B.A. Starodubtsev, chairman of the USSR Peasants Union and corresponding member of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, is firmly convinced that there is no point in waiting for private farmers to feed the country. In all civilized countries, he noted, the agrarian sector is undergoing concentration and specialization—only large farms have the capacity to feed people. If even one-third of collective and state farms are destroyed, he said, hunger is inevitable this very year.

The speaker stated that it is necessary to move toward the market. But before the market, in his opinion, there are 15 years of "hard and dirty work" ahead.

No one doubts the priority of the agricultural sphere but it should have been seen long ago that for many years now this priority has been unsupported. That is the opinion of Yu.V. Yaremenko, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Research Institute of the

Economy and the Forecasting of Scientific and Technical Progress and corresponding member of the union academy. The reason is, the speaker explained, that with the present qualitative level of the agricultural service sectors in our country and with the available resources the country cannot give the countryside adequate output in exchange. He believes that in this situation priority must be given, for example, to the extracting sectors, highlighting the oil industry, and the power industry.

People's Deputy S.L. Dimans, member of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, continued the theme of an economic treaty with the republics, highlighting the fact that by helping to create the market the treaty will also promote the durability of the future Union.

Discussing this question in more specific terms, he said that it is necessary to take a clear stand on economic jurisdiction: What will be implemented by Union norms and what by republic norms. In conjunction with this it is also necessary to define the union structures of executive power. This is a complex point, because it is contrary to the psychology of statehood, sovereignty, and independence, but it is clear that there must be a federal arbitration system, court, and prosecutor's office, because otherwise no progress will be made. He added that when concluding the treaties it is necessary to define mutual guarantees.

V.A. Medvedev, adviser to the USSR president and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said that in the very near future it will be necessary to cross the Rubicon. I consider the reform of prices and pricing to be such a Rubicon. Because after the introduction of new prices it will be necessary to begin to liberalize prices. Unless we do that the reform will produce nothing.

Speaking about the considerable number of mistakes in the period under review, the speaker cited the great hesitation influenced by variations in public opinion and the onset of populist feelings. The result of this is that the complex measures in the radical reform of our economic mechanism, launched in 1987, were successively eroded. The choice of the path of abolishing all linkage between money incomes and end results was also a major mistake.

In the implementation of social programs account was not always taken of the real potential, the speaker went on. In the past five years the development of the national economy has worsened, resources have diminished, but spending on social programs increased year by year.

In the speaker's opinion, the invariability of the course aimed at developing market relations should be reaffirmed authoritatively and powerfully. It must be backed up by specific steps.

The meeting was addressed by N.Ye. Pokorskaya, general director of Moscow's Salyut industrial commercial knitwear association; N.I. Bekh, president of the "Kamaz" joint stock company; A.I. Tizyakov, president of the association of state enterprises and associations in industry, construction, transport, and communications; V.V. Novikov, deputy general director of the "ZIL" production association; A.I. Volskiy, president of the Science and Industry Union; and V.M. Serov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Construction. A detailed account of all the speeches will be published in EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN.

Summing up the results of the meeting, M.S. Gorbachev said: I think that this has been a good brainstorming session. We now need to flesh out our course and our kind of baseline program that in the current situation would answer the question of what we are going to do in the months ahead. It is particularly important now not to permit any collapses [obvaly] in production. This is a political as well as an economic task. People should have work and an income. Production should make a profit and provide a basis for shaping Union, republic, and local budgets and for solving socioeconomic problems.

M.S. Gorbachev advocated returning once again to the conversion program, noting that nobody is satisfied with it at the moment and that, above all, its implementation is proceeding only slowly. The economy, structurally distorted by military production, is our big problem, he said. But the military sector of production affords us a huge opportunity. After all, there are huge opportunities in this area: highly skilled cadres, superb equipment, and modern technology. The complex can produce consumer goods and equipment for civil machine building, the light and food industries, the countryside, and the services sphere. The sphere devoted to the processing, storage, and transportation of agricultural produce has a particularly acute need for the military-industrial complex' help.

Stressing the need to develop small and medium businesses, the president pointed to the importance of creating the conditions for this and improving the legal base. It turns out that people work at the margins of the law and sometimes circumvent it, he said. We need to regulate a great deal in order to prevent enterprising people from breaking the law, and we must adjust the tax system.

Ending the conversation, M.S. Gorbachev stressed that the time demands clearly calculated decisions and that we are no longer able to delay or to get things wrong. M.S. Gorbachev called on the economists to step up the element of constructiveness in the discussion of these issues both in their scientific work, in the press, and at various conferences. He expressed the confidence that the views aired at the meeting will be taken into account by the Cabinet in its action program. It is planned to discuss this program in early April, finalize it through joint efforts, and ensure that it is implemented.

Miners Strikes Continue Throughout the Country

Largest Strike in Soviet History

LD1803183591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By correspondent Gennadiy Kondaurov]

[Excerpt] Fifty-eight collieries are on strike and nine collieries are not unloading coal in the Ukraine. This is really very serious and an official of the Ukrainian State Committee for Coal told me today that the strike is snowballing. I think that some of our officials simply underestimated this phenomenon when the first miners' strikes occurred.

It is the biggest social explosion in the more than 70 years of Soviet rule and many thought it was just a phenomenon provoked by some kind of extremists and that the miners just needed to be pacified. I cannot show you anything that has changed in the Donbass mines since the government resolution was adopted. We could travel round miners' villages and towns and not see a single change.

I think our government still suffers from the syndrome of let things take their own course. Look what collossal losses we are suffering: Donetsk and Voroshilovgrad oblasts have a shortfall of 1.25 million tons of coal deliveries to the country. Not only coke and chemical plants but also blast furnaces are now on low capacity, and they cannot go on like that—in a week they may be shut down and this means the whole chain of the metallurgical industry will be shut down. [passage omitted]

Strike Spreads to Southern Urals

LD1903091491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 19 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Mar (TASS)—The wave of the Soviet miners' strike movement is spreading. Today it reached the southern Urals. According to a TASS correspondent from Chelyabinsk, miners of the Chelyabinskugol association have backed the striking miners of the Donbass (Ukraine), Vorkuta (Komi Soviet Socialist Republic), and the Kuzbass (western Siberia). By this morning, five of the 10 mines in Chelyabinsk Oblast have ceased fuel production.

Miners of the southern Urals are putting forward economic and political demands. Among the primary demands are a pay raise and the so-called zonal differential applied to it. The miners also insist on the resignation of the USSR president and the repeal of the five percent sales tax imposed recently in the country.

The number of coal-mining enterprises in the Kuzbass stopping work due to the political strike has risen from 43 to 46 in the past 24 hours. There has been a deterioration in the already difficult situation with regard to raw material at the west Siberian metallurgical combine in Novokuznetsk—miners at the Yubileynaya mine, suppliing foundry workers with coal through a special pipeline conveyor, have gone on strike. The working people at the combine have asked the country's president and the chairman of the Soviet parliament to meet with representatives of the mining collectives to devise ways of escaping from the crisis and of stabilizing the situation.

The situation at the Donetsk coalfield remains difficult. In all, 22 of the 122 mines there have ceased operations either totally or partially.

The coordinating committee of the country's strike committees and the Executive Bureau of the Independent Union of Mineworkers are holding a press conference in Moscow today. Its main topic will be the progress of the miners' strike movement.

Trade Union Requests Strike's End

LD1803184291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] The long economic strike at individual pits in the Donbass is beginning to develop into an anti-worker movement, says an appeal to the miners of the Ukraine by the Central Committee of the trade union of workers in the metallurgical and mining industry of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic which was circulated today. The document stresses that by their actions the miners are placing their own interests in opposition to the interests of the working people of other industries in the republic and thereby splitting worker solidarity. Those who favor continuing the strike today, those who are striving toward the destruction of the metallurgical complex, thereby ending the possibility of exchanging metal for raw material resources the Ukraine needs so badly now, are acting directly against the economic sovereignty of the Ukraine, the appeal says.

Hopes Dim for Vorkuta Miners

PM1803164191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 p 1

[Special correspondent A. Kalinin report under the general heading "Why Are The Miners Up in Arms?": "Vorkuta"]

[Text] "An insane revolution" was the description of the current strike that erupted from Vladimir Gorbusev, secretary of the Coal Industry Workers' Trade Union territorial committee.

"The miners are up in arms. Everything is going to wrack and ruin," he shouted into the telephone receiver to his unseen listener. "And the main thing is that nothing will come out of this strike..."

Members of the city strike committee are not hopeful of definitely obtaining concessions from the government. They are not losing hope. A delegation has been sent to Moscow. Meanwhile various documents and appeals are being prepared at the strike committee and distributed. Here is one that was sent to the inhabitants of Saratov, who had collected money for the striking miners.

"We, the striking miners of Vorkuta, are waging a tough, unequal struggle against the government... We would like you to know that the miners are fighting not not just for their own material prosperity... We call on you to support the Vorkuta city miners in their unequal struggle against the corrupt totalitarian system."

In general funds are now coming into Vorkuta from various cities in Russia and indicate the liking and sympathy felt by workers in other sectors for the miners in revolt.

On Wednesday there were seven mines on some form of strike here. Some had not been working since 7 March. It is a critical time. Not just because the miners' families are very hard up. Not even because recovery from the strike will be hard, with large losses. The tragedy of the situation also lies in the fact that the houses of this polar region are heated by the casinghead gas that is obtained during coal mining.

"It is clear that, despite the results, we will withdraw mines from the strike," V. Kolesnikov, chairman of the strike committee, said. "But that will not denote defeat. We will merely suspend the strike until warmer weather. Then, if the government ignores our opinion, we will resume it."

The miners of another polar city, Inta, struck for just 24 hours. They have all resumed mining now. This was regarded as strikebreaking in Vorkuta.

Kuzbass Deputies Begin Hunger Strike

LD1803142991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] Representatives of Kuzbass miners have been on hunger strike for 6 days. Today, we contacted Bella Anatoliyevna Denisenko, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputy representing Kuzbass. She reads this statement:

[Denisenko] We, Yerofeyev, Kuzin, Lyubimkin, Malykhin, and Denisenko, RSFSR people's deputies representing Kuzbass, chairmen of the strike committees of four Kuzbass mines, have adopted a decision to go on political hunger strike in support of the demands of the striking regions in the country. Their main demand is the resignation of the president and the government of the USSR, dissolution of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and transfer of power to the Council of the Federation of Sovereign Republics. In addition to all their crimes, the Communist leadership has brought our country to the brink of death through famine. Gorbachev and his entourage are not able by themselves to take the only honest step and resign, so as to give the people of our country the opportunity to embark on the path of freedom and sufficiency.

We do not know how long our hunger strike will last. It is up to the energy and conscience of each individual to make his own decision. We thank everyone who sympathizes with us. We know we are not alone. God help us!

This statement was adopted 13 March, the first day of our hunger strike. Two days ago, two more Kuzbass miners—Belov and Yanin—joined us. We tried to reach Gorbachev to hand in this statement. Twenty-four hours later Lukyanov told us that the president had refused to meet us.

Donetsk Strike Update

LD1803172691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] Miners assembled again today on the square in front of the building housing the Donetsk soviet offices, following an appeal from the Donetsk Strike Committee. A meeting strike representatives took place. It was stated at the meeting that 13 of the 22 mines belong to the Donetskugol Association had stopped work. Most coal extracting enterprises of Krasnoarmeysk and Selidovo continue to refrain from work, along with two in Dobropolye and one in Khartsyzsk.

All in all, of a total of 122 mines, 22 have either completely or partially stopped their coal extracting operations. However, according to local reports, not all the workers the strike committee named as being among the strikers have, in fact, stopped work for example, during the first shift at the Imeni Gorkogo colliery, only 29 people refused to go underground, out of 1,156 miners, while drilling and extraction teams refused to join the strike at the leading enterprise of the Imeni Gazety Sotsialisticheskiy Donbass Mining Directorate, the Glubokaya colliery.

Rostov Miners Demand Double Pay

LD1803191291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By correspondent Nikolay Chebotarev]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The demands of the miners of Rostov Oblast are very similar to those of the miners of all of Donbass. These are, mainly, increasing pay by 2-2.5 times. The miners want to do what they please with the coal they mine. A ton of antracite, say, costs a miner 1.5 rubles [R] while a kg of meat at the market costs more than R15, and in some villages and towns of the miners' region up to R25-30. That is why many collectives want full and real economic independence. [passage omitted]

Strike Affects Coking Furnaces

LD1803134391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0500 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Excerpts] At a number of mines in the coal mining regions of the country, miners' strikes are continuing, posing both economic and political demands. Our correspondent in Kuzbass, Vladimir Yuryev, reports.

[Yuryev] The latest information is as follows: Late last night, 44 mines and one pit were taking part in the strike. This information was given to me at the oblast council of workers' committees. The situation is getting really complex and here, in front of me, I have a telegram which the whole of Kuzbass already knows—it has been published in a newspaper. The telegram is from Novotroitsk: for two weeks now, a blast furnace, yielding 3,000 tonnes of cast iron every 24 hours has been standing idle at our combine. There is no coke—no reserves of coking coal. It is not only the work of the coke shop that is under threat—we are faced with the prospect of the coking furnaces being put out of action. This means a complete stoppage of the combine's work. There is a similar situation at some other plants of the industry. [passage omitted] This telegram has come from the Orsk-Khalilovo combine, from the metallurgists.

But the trouble is that it is not the only such telegram. Because the metallurgists of Nizhniy Tagil combine, and at Karaganda, are faced with the same situation. I wonder how the metallurgical plants in the Ukraine are still working; their reserves of coke will not last for 48 hours. The same with power workers. But what is it I want to say and ask now? Is it only the striking miners who are to blame for this? Of course the strike is intensifying all our economic difficulties. But still, let us look at the figures.

The main losses occured at a time when the miners were not striking. Why has the coal output in Kuzbass decreased over the recent time? I will give you three figures, and you will be able to judge for yourselves, and come to your own conclusions. The Kuznetsk coalfield accounts for more than a quarter of the total fuel output of the Ministry of the Coal Industry of the country. But the ministry only assigns 16 or 17 percent of its funds for the development of the Kuzbass. Generally, over the last years, capital investment in the Kuzbass has been 25 percent less than the average figures in this industrial branch. [passage omitted]

Coalfield Unrest Considered

PM1903102991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Aleksandr Nikitin: "Do Not Throw Rocks at the Miners! A Way Has To Be Found Out of the Impasse"]

[Text] Many rocks are being hurled at the miners at the moment, figuratively speaking. Whence and why? Are there serious reasons, is it a combination of circumstances? If one is to believe the heavy industry "generals," it is essentially due to... a shortage of coal for coke ovens. Blast furnaces have been switched to slow speed. Power stations could come to a halt. Then it would be cold and dark for everyone. The strikers are bringing many other inexcusable problems. Now, the "generals" ask, how can you love a working class detachment that was so heroic only yesterday?

The Kuzbass miners have a quite different assessment of the situation. It is as if they are stepping out of the small world of work and heading down the road of noncommittal political ultimatums: They are demanding the resignation of the president and of the entire government. There is a great patchwork of demands. "We believe," M. Krylov, cochairman of the Donetsk strike committee, told the POSTFACTUM agency, "that such statements by the Kuzbass miners are inopportune and unnecessary." Why? "We are seeking implementation of the demands that were set out in July 1989. The Kuzbass miners are demanding the disbandment of the government we are expecting to implement our demands. Where is the logic in that?.."

Indeed, it is not that easy to see the logic of many of the demands right away. From the comic strip, political ultimatums were issued the other day by a not unknown speaker at Cinema House to the specific demands to raise pay by 100-150 percent and to improve other benefits for all "underground workers" in, for example, Rostov Oblast. Incidentally, the vast majority of demands recorded in the celebrated resolution 608 have been implemented. But there is also the Russian government resolution, that the strikers forget about.

The "Karagandaugol" production association administration, PRAVDA correspondent V. Ryzhkov reported, has submitted an application to the oblast court for the miners' strike to be declared illegal. The association has estimated that the damage caused by the miners' strike stands at over 9 million rubles [R]. An action for damages in this amount will be brought against the miners' territorial council and oblast strike committee. But will the miners' organizations be able to pay such a large sum? Or will the upcoming judicial proceedings be yet another attempt to prove that not all our laws are ineffective?

The miners' own experience indicates that the solution of many vital problems is perfectly possible without recourse to the courts. Once they had major worker supply departments, whose stores perhaps even surpassed the state trade network in terms of the riches on offer. Who is stopping all this being resurrected in such difficult transitional times? Particularly as there is plenty of land near mines, including land that can be recultivated. Not only orchards and truck gardens, but they used to have plenty of their own fresh fish in the Donbass, for example.

In short, we have a strange situation in the coalfields. Representatives of strike committees are besieging Moscow and the central organs of power, yet they appear to have no particular criticism of their own republican, in particular local soviets, where miners' deputies sometimes constitute a majority. The same can be said of economic organs of self-management: associations, concerns. Their collectives are still demanding economic freedoms. Who is stopping them?

The answers to some of these questions are supplied by the emissaries of the newly arrived right-wing political groups and parties, judging by the slogans in the crowd encouraging the miners: "Miners! 'Democratic Russia' and the whole of Moscow are behind you." Many other "visiting cards" of specifically Moscow groups and associations are visible in the crowd. The very people whom the miners, on their home ground, call "miners from the capital." In that case strikes are no longer compatible with economic legislation.

Finally, Moscow simply does not pay enough attention to the miners. Sometimes too much thought is given to getting cheap coal quickly than to improving miners' lives. Only yesterday, our eyes on the Persian Gulf, it appeared that we were privy to all the details, sometimes even the minutest details of the fierce war for oil. Papers all over the world were writing: "Oil and blood do not mix!" Ye. Primakov was forever in Iraq.

But how are things for our miners? Who is contacting them? More often than not Minister Shkadov, to whom they have not paid much attention since the stagnation era.

So the miners wait. Will they have to go to the sultan of Turkey, as the Zaporozhye Cossacks once had to? No. In fact, new premier V. Pavlov is devising his own tactics of behavior and is not following N. Ryzkov's example. He told journalists at a press conference that he does not intend to play nursemaid to the strikers. Let the production associations and corporations sort out their own problems in conjunction with the trade unions. The government will only act as mediator, as they do abroad.

Probably the premier believes that the country has already made the transition to the market, that the miners are perfectly free in terms of their economic aspirations. But, the other day, he changed his position: He is prepared to meet with miners, but not... with strikers. What does that mean? The miners have to resume work and only then will talks commence. In any event, both sides have to seek ways that will help resolve the impasse.

Here is what the sector trade unions propose: "The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is to immediately start talks with the coal industry workers' trade union to seek mutually acceptable solutions to the problems, taking into account the interests of working people in other sectors. It is necessary to immediately set up a USSR General Confederation of Trade Union and Cabinet of Ministers consultative commission to ensure a systematic, ongoing examination of any acute situations that exist or arise in the basic sectors of the national economy."

In turn, the sector trade unions urged the striking miners to soberly and responsibly assess the situation in the country and in related sectors, and begin, with the trade union's participation, a dialogue with the government.

The political as well as economic purport of the document is perfectly clear. To give the miners real help and prevent destructive extremist politicians from "entering paradise" on their shoulders. It must not be forgotten that the miners have a special kind of insight. Having become accustomed to the darkness of the pit, they are blinded for a time by the bright spring sun. But they then have much sharper sight!

Shcherbakov on Market Transition

LD1803161191 Moscow TASS in English 1452 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 18 TASS—The formation of new forms of economic activity, the role of taxes and prices under market conditions, the problems of employment and social protection of people as well as familiarisation with foreign experience in this respect constitute the range of items on the agenda of a conference on the subject "transition to a market: strategy and tactics", which opened here today.

The conference is being attended by chiefs of various branches of the economy, representatives of central economic departments, leading scientists, and members of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

The need to consider the above-mentioned issues are prompted by the times and by the overall situation that has taken shape in the Soviet Union.

The country has closely approached the translation of a new socio-economic policy in practice, USSR Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov told the conference.

A transition to new economic relations does not promise to be an easy one. Production slump has assumed threatening proportions already now, speakers at the conference pointed out. Over the past two months national income decreased by ten per cent while the population's incomes grew by 23 per cent.

In this situtation the government intends to take a number of economic measures in the coming two to three months to restore the broken economiC ties and stabilise the economic situation. The measures include transfer of state property to other owners, the abolition of superfluous managerial elements, and strict measures to make the economy healthier financially.

Conference organisers—the International Foundation for the Training of Personnel for Work under Market

Economy Conditions, the Intertraining Association and the Interbank—believe that this widely-representative forum, which is being attended by several thousand people, will help work out a coordinated strategy and tactics for the behaviour of businesses under conditions of new economic relations.

Retail Prices Set To Rise 2 April

LD1803170691 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR Government has announced that retail prices will rise in the territory of the Soviet Union on 2 April 1991. Our correspondent is talking to to Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices.

[Correspondent] Vyacheslav Konstantinovich, to what extent will the prices currently being adopted at the center be mandatory for the republics?

[Senchagov] Huge collectives of specialists took part in [illegible] reform, including prices, finance and labor economy, and they worked together. This is actually the first economic measure to be achieved as a result of coordinating, by linking various interests, of the republics, I mean.

[Correspondent] It is will known that in different regions of our country different products form the stable food. Will this be reflected in prices? For example, in Kazakhstan it's meat, in Uzbekistan it's bread and rice.

[Senchagov] Differences in consumption and generally in the functioning of the national markets in the republics has been taken into account. In this sense, it is a more realistic policy. Ceiling prices have been set by consent with the republics. Uzbekistan, for example, considering the peculiarities of consumption, the significance of bread in the staple diet, will raise prices by a smaller amount, or perhaps will actually decide not to raise prices for bread. But, in that case, Uzbekistan has to find funds in its budget to...

[Correspondent, interrupting] Raise them for other food products, that is, by means of some other price increases.

[Senchagov] In the final analysis, that's it.

[Correspondent] That is, the central authorities are still only giving guideline prices, and the republics take the final decision themselves.

[Senchagov] Yes, but the view predominates among the republics, and this is a very interesting observation, it's the first time I've come across it, that they should still adhere to more or less the same level.

[Correspondent] To what extent will our prices, set by the center, be reflected in prices in the Baltic region? Prices are higher there, meat costs R10 there.

[Senchagov] Yes, prices are higher there, and I think that the Baltics can look at two options. One option is to set prices at the ceilings set by our government, and the second option is to keep the existing prices. As a specialist, I would keep them.

Price Increase Compensation Detailed

914A0526 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 11, Mar 91 p 5

[Article by N. Zhelnorova: "Our Life After the Price Increase"]

[Text] It is quite possible that the retail price increase will have been announced by the time our readers receive ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. This may happen within the period 20 March to 5 April. **What kind of prices are in store for us?**

The prices of the first group of goods, comprising the "consumer basket," will be doubled or tripled. They will be rigidly set by the government. Compensation will cover only this basket, consisting of 296 types of goods and services.

COMPENSATION. All working people will receive 60 rubles [R] a month, retirees R65, and children R40 (not including a price increase adjustment for children's goods).

How big a share of the price increase will the people receive as compensation? The prime minister says 80 percent, the president says 100 percent. Which of them is not quite honest?

It seems that neither of them is. The prime minister means the share of the "consumer basket" goods price increase that will be repaid to the people. What the president means is that everything will be repaid, but 15 percent of the profit earned by the new prices will go to the local soviets, who can spend the money as they deem necessary.

SOURCES OF COMPENSATION. Most of it will come from the consumption funds at the enterprise where the head of the family or a member of the family is employed.

Will the enterprise have the right to pay larger compensation than that proposed by the government?

Yes, if the enterprise has the financial resources to do so and the personnel so decide.

SUBSISTENCE MINIMUM. The subsistence minimum will almost double compared to the R70 level where it has stayed until now. The enterprise has to pay its employees, whatever their workload, wages not lower than that level, i.e. R135-140.

WORK PAY. The price increase will ensure a reform of wages also. We have learned that the corresponding agencies are preparing a decision that will remove any limitations on the formation of the consumption fund. Besides this, it will considerably expand workers' rights with respect to bonuses, additional payments, and raises.

How will prices be set for the goods outside the consumer basket?

The second group of more expensive goods will be sold at **limited prices** set by the government in agreement with the USSR Supreme Soviet. It will be prohibited to raise prices higher than the set level.

The third group the most expensive goods, will include precious metals, cars, hi-fi electronic equipment, all foreign-made fashionable items, etc., will sell at **free market prices.**

No compensation will be paid for the price increases of the second and third group goods. That means that the poor sectors of the population will be protected from the price reform and the main blow will fall on families with average or high income.

PERSONAL SAVINGS. Anyone is allowed now to withdraw more than R500 from his savings bank account (if he has adequate funds there). No stamping of his passport is required any more as this is illegal. Savings indexation is being designed that will probably allow the savings to be increased by the amount of the "consumer basket" price increase.

Will the money reform continue?

The government insists that "it will not do it any more." However, unofficial information exists that R500 and R1,000 bank notes might be put into circulation.

Agricultural

Cabinet Examines Latest Farming Emergency

PM1903102591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by M. Petrov: "Cabinet of Ministers Ponders Spring Sowings"]

[Text] The USSR Cabinet of Ministers held a regular session 14 March at which questions concerning preparations for the spring field work were discussed. Union republic agrarian department leaders participated in the discussions.

We know that on the previous day Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov had been at the "Ramenskoye" agro-association. It was there, during a short interview with a Central Television correspondent, that he announced the Cabinet's intention to undertake measures to stabilize the situation which has arisen on the eve of the spring sowings. A country which gives no thought to the new harvest, he stressed, gives no thought to its own future. When opening the 14 March session, he developed his line of thought thus: It is obvious that we cannot feed the people on economic incentive alone insofar as this incentive has not yet reached the desired level. In addition, therefore, we must contemplate administrative measures, too. The country must understand us: We are not against democracy, but it is not worth rejecting other methods which will if not increase the production of foodstuffs then at least maintain it at the former level.

It became clear from V.I. Chernoivanov's announcements when speaking recently in his capacity as USSR minister of agriculture and food that a fall in the overall level of agricultural production, especially grain, is a very real possibility. Last year winter crop sowings were down by over 4 million hectares, and 7-8 million hectares will have to be newly planted if winterkill is taken into account. The area prepared last fall for the spring sowings is 20 million hectares smaller than in 1990. It follows that the volume of spring field work is increased by approximately 25 percent. That is not all: The serious shortage of spare parts, diesel fuel and oil, and artificial fertilizers, and poor preparation of sowing material intensifies an already critical situation.

One could go on listing the troubles in the agrarian complex, and this is precisely what the republic ministers speaking at the session did.

The interesting thing is this: Once again, as it became clear, it is only now on the very eve of the sowing campaign that the depth of the crisis engulfing our country's agro-industrial complex has been revealed. But was it really so unexpected? Of course not: History is repeating itself. You cannot help wondering, rhetorically, what would have happened if the new premier had not invited the leaders of the agrarian and affiliated agricultural departments to the Cabinet session.

It is strange, for example, to hear N.M. Olshanskiy, chairman of the board of the state association "Agrokhim," assert that he is prepared to take it on himself to find out the detailed reasons why several artificial fertilizer and other plant protection agent plants have halted production. For the record, I will point out that they closed on the insistent demand of the "greens." The premier quite reasonably asked this question: Were the reasons for the decline in capacity not obvious already? It seems not: There had been no instruction to this effect from... the Cabinet of Ministers. But these problems for the sectors did not emerge overnight. This year "Agrokhim" carried debts of around 107 million foreign currency rubles with foreign firms. They must be paid without delay. But how, when domestic output does not even provide sufficient supplies of nitrate and phosphate fertilizers for our own kolkhozes and sovkhozes? The discussions highlighted such stalemate situations on more than one occasion. Once again they were met with confusion by ministers who lacked any clear plan of action.

The premier put the following question to N.A. Pugin, minister of automobile and agricultural machine building: Nikolay Andreyevich, do you know that as a result of the halt in equipment deliveries from what used to be the GDR the spare parts problem will worsen? You know, our best farms were equipped with imported equipment. They want nothing to do with your equipment—it is expensive and of poor quality. Nikolay Andreyevich confessed frankly: It is the first I have heard of it. For reasons unknown to the minister there had been a sharp increase—four- to seven-fold in some cases—in the prices of systems and equipment.

A.P. Ustyuzhanin, RSFSR deputy minister of agriculture and food, issued the following information: The shortfall due to price levels on republic farms, even those which foresee a profit, is going to be 21 billion rubles. This means that not only loss-making farms will need favorable credit. In all, only a quarter of the planned number of written contracts has been concluded: Farms in such a situation are not risking taking on any further commitments.

Many suggestions for ways out of the crisis were put forward at the session. Moreover the variety of approaches was visible, as the saying goes, with the naked eye. For example, one way is to hand agricultural machine building over to the independent sector, while another is to create joint enterprises. (Incidentally, this is already being done with the firms "John Deere" and "Caterpillar"). F.V. Mirochitskiy, Belorussian minister of agriculture and foodstuffs, proposed finally to set in earnest about elaborating the all-Union "Grain" program, based on efficient technologies. Another version was also proposed—the immediate expansion of the sown areas.

In summarizing the proposals submitted, deputy premier F.P. Senko noted that of course it is necessary to elaborate specific programs and finance new equipment, but this has to be done gradually. Right now, on the eve of the sowings, attention has to be focused on using equipment effectively and involving drivers from the cities in the spring field work. Available fertilizers should be used only on grain, beets, and potatoes, so as not to exhaust already scarce resources. The Tsentrosoyuz [Central Union of Consumer Societies] has been commissioned to purchase the necessary 1.6 million tonnes of seed potatoes from the population in exchange for high-demand goods, while a proportion of the potatoes already purchased in Poland and the FRG is to be used as seed.

It remains to be said that these resolute measures are not new. Year after year this "urgent" situation arises and is accompanied by "urgent" means of solving the problems. In the wake of the Cabinet of Ministers' session, I personally still have a question: Will there ever be a spring which does not catch the country unawares?

Scientific

Progress Burns Up in Atmosphere After Mission

LD1503214391 Moscow TASS in English 2136 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 16 TASS—A TASS correspondent learned from the Mission Control Centre that the flight of Progress M-6 automatic transport ship was completed on Friday. The ship delivered over two tonnes of various cargoes to "Mir" orbital complex.

The transport ship separated from the manned station at 15 hours 47 minutes Moscow time. After braking by means of the engine the ship passed on to the descent trajectory, entered dense layers of the Earth's atmosphere and burned there.

Space Officials Interviewed on Remote Surveys

LD1703115391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Nework in Russian 0640 GMT 17 Mar 91

[Text] [Announcer] Cosmodrome and the Far North is the subject of a report by our correspondent, Valentin Bogomolov.

[Bogomolov] On clear, cloudless nights the citizens of Arkhangel sometimes see rockets rising into the sky above the city. Occasionally they are mistaken for UFO's but, at all events, everybody here knows that the world's busiest space launch site, Plesetsk, lies right next door to Archangel. But what benefit do Arkhangel Oblast and the Far North, which lie under the rockets' flight path, derive from the Cosmodrome? This is the question we put to Col. Grin, one of its commanders

[Grin] Recently we launched the Informator spacecraft. This is the first experiment in a series intended to test ways of maintaining communications with remote regions of the country, with settlements, with geological prospecting teams, with those regions and installations within the country where the use of traditional means of communication is inappropriate and economically unviable.

Recently, at the end of December, we signed an agreement on the launch of the Resurs spacecraft, which is designed to survey the earth's mineral resources and carry out ecological monitoring. In other words, it will carry out a comprehensive survey of Archangel Oblast in the interests of the national economy. It will study the location of mineral resources, the use of timber resources, and the ecological situation in Archangel Oblast.

[Bogomolov] I know that geologists are obliged to acquire satellite charts from the Americans. Can they not see your space photographs?

[Grin] Of course they can. Furthermore, as a deputy in the oblast soviet, I took part in this work. Maps compiled from satellite measurements, including ones of other

oblasts of the Soviet Union, were displayed at a session of the oblast soviet. Some of these measurements were taken during orbits over oblasts which neighbor Arkhangel Oblast.

[Bogomolov] Here is what Gen. Oleynik, the commander of the Cosmodrome, had to say about the benefit which Archangel Oblast derives from the Cosmodrome.

[Oleynik] The program can be adjusted to find out how man's activity is affecting the environment in Archangel Oblast, where the ecological situation has deteriorated lately. But I do not know the activities of the Cosmodrome for this. Rather it is the fault of industrial enterprises located in Archangel Oblast. Our spacecraft will be able to assess the extent of air and water pollution, the state of forestry plantations, and the state of the soil. We will also be able to measure the impact of human activities in our region on the ozone layer.

[Bogomolov] But is this not very expensive? Every launch costs many millions of rubles.

[Oleynik] The life of man and the future of the region are more important than the money we plan to spend on this reserch. [end recording]

[Announcer] I wholly agree with that last remark. I remind you that the life of man is more precious than the money spent on scientific research, especially as the next generation, in other words our children, is at stake. One hopes that our small loved ones will be able to eat clean food, swim in clean rivers, and breathe clean air. If they do, maybe they will be morally better than us. One very much hopes so.

Aerospace Research Assistance Offered Abroad

HK1503030391 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] The Soviet Union is prepared to assist foreign aviation companies design space shuttles and commercial aircraft. This was declared by Aleksandr Geroshenko, deputy minister of the Soviet aviation industry, to newsmen in Manila during the International Air Show being held in Villamor Airbase. According to Geroshenko, the Soviet Union was among the first to engage in aerospace research, for which capital, in the experience of other countries, is often lacking.

Geroshenko said that the 20 countries joining in the present air show have decided to set up an international group that will coordinate aerospace research.

Military

Officials Attend Military CPSU Conferences

Shenin Addresses Moscow MD Party

PM1503152991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Mar 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by Reserve Colonel F. Semyanovskiy: "New Structures"]

[Text] The formation of new party structures has been completed in the Moscow Military District. This was made known when the delegates to a district party conference elected the district party committee and the control commission.

Progress in restructuring party work and implementing the 28th CPSU Congress decisions, and the communists' tasks to make their activities more effective in present-day conditions were discussed in the report by Lieutenant General A. Makunin, Military Council member and chief of the district Political Directorate, and the speeches by Colonel General N. Kalinin, district commander, and other delegates.

O. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in and addressed the conference.

Baklanov Meets With Western Group

PM1903092391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent V. Izgarshev: "Conversations At Garrisons"]

[Text] Berlin, 17 Mar—O. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was visiting Western Group of Forces garrisons last week in connection with the holding of a party conference, which was reported in PRAVDA. He visited firing ranges and training classes and met with officers, warrant officers, soldiers and sergeants, and members of servicemen's families.

Luchinskiy Addresses Air Force

PM1803135991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Colonel A. Manushkin: "Party Conferences"]

[Text] An Air Force party conference has been held. The report delivered by Aviation Lieutenant General G. Benov, member of the organizational committee, and the speeches delivered by Aviation Colonel General Ye. Shaposhnikov, Lieutenant Colonel F. Orlov, and others had as their leitmotif the idea of the need to close party ranks.

P. Luchinskiy, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the work of the party conference and addressed it.

Colonel A. Vozov was elected secretary of the Air Force party committee.

The party conference delegates unanimously adopted an appeal in which they urged people on referendum day to say "yes" to a renewed USSR.

Prokofyev Addresses Air Defense Forces

PM1803120791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the "Official" rubric: "Party Conference"]

[Text] The Air Defense Forces' party conference completed its work 14 March.

The Communists' action program states its support for the political statement issued by the combined CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission January (1991) Plenum, the party's socialist choice, and its policy in the sphere of the country's defense.

Yu.A. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom [City Party Committee], took part in the conference's work.

Stroyev Addresses Railroad Troops

PM1803094291 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Major V. Linenko report under the rubric "Party Conferences": "For Greater Organization and Discipline"]

[Text] A railroad troops party conference has taken place.

The report by Lieutenant General A. Stolyarov, chairman of the organizing committee, and speeches by Colonel General M. Makartsev, chief of the railroad troops, and other delegates focused on concrete ways of achieving an organizational and ideological strengthening of the troops' party collectives based on the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress.

The conference elected a party committee led by Major General V. Sosnin.

Ye. Stroyev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the conference's work.

Air Force Chief of Staff on Gulf Lessons

PM1803165791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Lieutenant General of Aviation A. Malyukov, chief of Air Force Main Staff, by Captain S. Sidorov; place and not given: "Gulf War: Initial Conclusions; Air Power Predetermined Outcome"]

[Excerpts] The war in the Persian Gulf provided a textbook example of what air supremacy means both for the country that gained it, and for the country ceding it to the opponent. A KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer discusses some aspects of the use of aviation in that conflict with Lieutenant General of Aviation A. Malyukov, chief of the Air Force Main Staff: [passage omitted]

[Sidorov] Is it possible to view the actions of the allies' aviation as a practical application of one of the components of the NATO concept of "Air-Land Battle," devised, as is known, for the European theater and directed against the Soviet Armed Forces?

[Malyukov] I do not think so. There was no classical "Air-Land Battle." Why? The point is that this war—and here [General] Dugan comes to mind—was obviously conceived from the outset as an air war to wear out the opponent by means of air strikes, disorganize his command systems, destroy his air defenses, and weaken the ground forces' strike power. Therefore, in terms of the choice of objectives, it was more a question of a classical air offensive. The objectives were achieved. In general, this is the first time we have witnessed a war where the aviation took care almost entirely of all the main tasks.

[Sidorov] Did the Iraqi Air Force put up a resistance in the air, were there any air fights?

[Malyukov] It is difficult to appraise the actions of the Iraqi Air Force, since there were very few of them. Whereas in the past there have been armed conflicts—also in this region—where classical air battles were fought on the basis of a plan involving tactical groups and the participation of a substantial number of forces, we have witnessed nothing of the kind during this war.

[Sidorov] Does this mean that the Soviet hardware proved insufficiently effective in comparison with U.S. hardware, as certain news agencies are trying to claim?

[Malyukov] I believe that this view is far from the truth. First, because only isolated, sporadic fights took place, hardly providing sufficient grounds for this kind of conclusion. Second, the very fact of unorganized resistance in the air points to mistakes of both tactical and operational-strategic nature committed by the Iraqi leadership in the use of the Air Force. For the umpteenth time we were able to witness that the effectiveness of any weapon ultimately hinges on the people who use it. Any flaw in the command system or pilot training can lead to a defeat. Finally, it is not enough to have modern aviation in the arsenal—which Iraq had—operational and material and technical support must also be assured.

[Sidorov] How did our helicopters fare? Much has been written in the past about their viability and robustness in desert conditions.

[Malyukov] In this case it has not been possible to appraise the effectiveness of the use of army aviation in a specific situation for the simple reason that such a situation never arose. After all, helicopters do not operate on their own. They always operate in conjunction with the ground forces, as an integral part of an offensive or active defense plan, forming part of the battle order. Since the allies gave the Iraqi troops virtually no chance to mount such operations, the latter, it appears, refrained from using their helicopters. [passage omitted]

[Sidorov] You mentioned certain trends in the development of aviation that have emerged in the course of the war. How would you formulate the conclusions from an analysis of the military sides in the conflict for Air Force building?

[Malyukov] From the first days of the combat operations it was clear that this was a war of modern high-tech facilities, that is of everything that modern aviation represents. He who does not realize this runs the risk of falling hopelessly behind the process of the qualitative improvement of aviation equipment with all the ensuing consequences. Naturally, it is not possible to say: Let's drop everything and develop the Air Force at the expense of other services. But there can be no two opinions about the fact that the Air Force requires major investments.

After all, what is a modern combat aircraft? It is a most sophisticated system. Its utilization demands serious and well thought-out backup measures. Take, for example the B-52. While performing combat tasks it was enjoying extensive information backup and fighter aircraft and electronic countermeasure cover. There is only one conclusion—everything must be developed comprehensively and then, when the whole system comes into play, it will produce the corresponding results.

[Sidorov] Many U.S. experts, with reference to the experience gained during the conflict, speak of the clear inadequacy of military transport aviation for moving combat hardware and troops over long distances. There are no military concepts in our country calling for the movement of troops and their hardware to other continents. Nonetheless, let us recall January of last year when it became necessary to close the Soviet-Iranian border as a matter of urgency.

[Malyukov] Difficulties exist, of course. No country has an excess of military transport aviation. This type of aviation always implements tasks under great pressure. Whenever the need arises to transfer a sizeable grouping somewhere, we usually use virtually the whole of our military transport aviation, possibly leaving a small reserve. Naturally, this is a problem, especially if you take into account that our aircraft are getting old... New aircraft are needed.

What we need is an optimum correlation between combat and backup means. As the experience of the war has shown, the main NATO countries' armed forces have resolved this problem. In our country, the trend toward priority development of combat hardware, of its visible combat potential, unfortunately persisted for a long time, while operational and material and technical backup remained in the background. However, these types of backup have a direct and immediate bearing on the effectiveness of the use of combat hardware. One of the components of this backup is military transport aviation performing a great many tasks in peacetime; as for wartime, as the war in the Persian Gulf has graphically demonstrated, comment is superfluous.

U.S., Soviet Treatment of Soldiers Contrasted

PM1803120591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Union Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Nadein report: "America Greeted Its Prisoners of War, and I Stood and Thought About Ours"]

[Excerpts] Washington—When the aircraft, symbolically called Liberty-1, landed at Andrews Air Force Base near Washington... At the very same base where heads of government and the most honored guests are ceremonially greeted... When thousands of people shouted, wept, laughed, clapped, waved flags... When the first person in military uniform appeared on the steps, saluted, and then began to descend slowly, supported by crutches... When they then carried someone out on a stretcher, also wearing military uniform and saluting the flag... From that very first minute I felt bitter because our people do not give such a welcome. To ours. [passage omitted]

Like every victorious war, this one has resulted in an explosion of patriotism whose extremes, of course, verge on chauvinist emotions.

However, I, as someone from another country, was particularly impressed with the heartfelt and sincere links between the Army and the general public which the highest military officials sought to maintain with all their might. When some young women journalists at news conferences in the Pentagon put questions to Lieutenant General T. Kelly which, even to my unenlightened eye as a lieutenant in the reserve, were quite out of place, the general would reply with patience and good humor.

"What is strange about that?" a journalist acquaintance here expressed surprise at my perplexity. "It is perfectly probable that questions as silly as you say these are torment wives and mothers all over the country. The people must have faith in the army, and there are more wives and mothers among the people than there are soldiers."

Among the numerous peaceful protest demonstrations there was not one where anger or even simply hostility was directed against the soldiers and officers who participated in this war. Only love and support were expressed for them.

The sense of incomprehension and bitterness that sometimes divides the Army and the civilian population in our country is one of the most painful wounds in our society today. I am sorry to admit it, but the touching and ceremonial welcome for former prisoners of war at the airbase near Washington made me envious. How I dreamed that our guys, whose life in Afghan captivity has been no better than the Americans' life in Husayn's jails, should be greeted in just the same way both by our ministers and by our generals.

Armed Forces Group Protest Yeltsin's Appeal

91UM0469A Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jan 91 p 2

["Open Letter to Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, President of the USSR, and People's Deputies of the USSR and RSFSR"]

[Text] We veterans of war, the USSR Armed Forces, and labor, who have given our all for a strengthening of the economic might and the defense of our Soviet motherland and its salvation from fascist enslavement, are angered by the content of B. Yeltsin's appeal to Soviet fighting men drafted into the Army from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and his signing, in defiance of the decisions of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, of the "Statement on the Actions of the Leadership of the Soviet Union in Respect of the Baltic States" addressed to the United Nations and the governments of all states, and by other provocative actions of B. Yeltsin and his supporters. Full of concern for the fate of our fatherland—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—and its defense capability, we appeal to you, our elect, to adopt the most decisive measures to put a stop to the reckless actions of B. Yeltsin and other anti-Soviets aimed at the destruction of the unity of the Soviet Union and the undermining of the fighting capability of the USSR Armed Forces. Please understand, they have a single goal—destruction of our Soviet motherland.

We believe that there are among you many communists, real Soviet people, who are boundlessly devoted to our Soviet land and who understand your particular responsibility for the fate of our socialist fatherland and the unity of our multinational state, for the sake of whose creation and defense tens of millions of the best sons and daughters of our people gave their lives. Remember this when adopting decisions concerning the fate of the world's first socialist state. Fighting men of our army, the illustrious successors of the heroic history of the USSR Armed Forces, profoundly aware of their responsibility for the defense of socialism, are endeavoring at the cost of their lives to defend the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and bar the way to nationalist, separatist, and terrorist forces igniting national discord and plunging the peoples into fratricidal war, and hundreds of our slain compatriots and hundreds and thousands of refugees are on the conscience of these renegades of society and their defenders.

All anti-Soviet forces have now bestirred themselves to ensure that responsibility for the tragic events in Vilnius provoked by Landsbergis, the true continuer of the cause of his father—an underling of the German-fascist aggressors—who has in practice already accomplished a bourgeois coup in Lithuania, be placed on our fighting men, who are called occupation forces in this and the other republics of the Baltic. This blasphemous outrage against the memory of hundreds of thousands of Soviet soldiers who gave their lives for the liberation of the Baltic from the German-fascist aggressors evoked no anger in B. Yeltsin. Also a matter of indifference to him is the fate of the Russian-speaking and other population of the republics.

We believe that our sons and grandsons drafted into the Army from the RSFSR and serving in the Baltic are complying with Article 29 of the RSFSR Constitution, which states that the USSR Armed Forces were created "to defend socialist gains.... The duty of the USSR Armed Forces to the people is to reliably defend the socialist fatherland" since a real threat to the gains of socialism has arisen in these republics. So B. Yeltsin's references to this article are irresponsible.

We ask that you adopt an attentive approach to study of the question of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's ratification of the treaties with the Baltic republics since they are directed against the Soviet Union.

We express no confidence in the people working in the mass media, who are opposed to the unity of our state and are engaged in defaming the USSR Armed Forces.

On behalf of 160 participants in a meeting of the M.V. Frunze Soviet Army Central Club Military-Scientific Society, members of the meeting presidium:

[Signed] I. Bulychev, Ye. Volobuyev, A. Kotsov, Ya. Mayorov, S. Popov, Yu. Chepikov, I. Shavrov.

Western Group Forces Sell Off Material Assets

PM1803092091

[Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 March 1991 First Edition carries on page 5 an untitled photo feature by Lieutenant Colonel V. Khabarov comprising two photos showing general scenes from an exhibition of military property and a 300-word commentary, which reads as follows:

"This exhibition, which is being held in the Western Group of Forces, is the first and only one of its kind. On show at the exhibition are all the group forces' riches, which we are putting up for sale to Western firms and private individuals. Here you can buy everything from an airfield to a school, from a modern bridgelayer to a humble nail and scrap metal.

"During the group of forces' 46-year stay on the territory of the former GDR, enormous reserves of material assets were accumulated here. It would be either very expensive or simply impossible to take all these to the Motherland, the Soviet Union. And so, remembering the bitter experience of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, the group command decided to show our riches to Western businessmen, and offer to sell them at reasonable prices.

"In the words of V. Sukhorukov, representative of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations: 'Initial results are encouraging. The first deals and contracts have been

made. There is considerable interest in us. Although we also have a number of problems in this kind of work, that is new to us.'

"All the money received from the sale will go on building apartments for officers and warrant officers from the Western Group of Forces being withdrawn from Germany."

Baykonur Chief Describes Space Defense Systems

PM1803164791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Mar 91 First Edition p 4

[Reply to reader's letter by Lieutenant General A. Kryzhko, chief of Baykonur Cosmodrome: "Space Sentries"—first two paragraphs are a reader's letter]

[Text] I know that space facilities for various purposes exist in our country, including military facilities. Could you tell us, please, how these facilities are used to protect our borders.

Signed: N. Lyapin, engineer, Kokand.

Lieutenant General A. Kryzhko, chief of Baykonur Cosmodrome:

There are various kinds of military space devices. They form part, for example, of the warning system against missile attack on USSR territory and are designed to detect launches of ICBM's from parts of continents and the world ocean which present a threat of missile launches.

A missile attack warning system detects mass, group, and single launches of ballistic missiles and transmits this information automatically to control posts.

How does it detect enemy missiles? Ballistic missiles launched outside the USSR borders are detected by means of a thermal direction finder which locks onto the infrared radiation emanating from the flare of the ballistic missile's engine.

There are also space-based observation devices used as national means for monitoring the observance of international strategic and conventional arms reduction treaties. These satellites carry photo-electronic apparatus of varying spectral ranges, making it possible to perform specific tasks at any time of day and night and in any weather conditions.

Military Leaders Sign Official's Obituary

PM1803145991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 First Edition p 8

[Obituary of V.N. Dutov]

[Excerpts] Hero of Socialist Labor Colonel General Vladimir Nikolayevich Dutov (retired), a veteran of the Great Patriotic War, has died after a grave, prolonged illness. He devoted his entire conscious life to the cause of the defense of the socialist Motherland and to selfless service to the Soviet people and the Communist Party, of which had had been a member since 1931.

V.N. Dutov was born 19 February 1909 in the village of Pukasovka, Letichevskiy Rayon, Khmelnitskiy Oblast. [passage omitted] After the war V.N. Dutov headed the financial service of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany and from 1950 worked in the central apparatus of the USSR Defense Ministry. For over 30 years he was chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Financial Directorate and in this post made a big contribution to the improvement of financial services for the army and navy. [passage omitted]

[Signed] D.T. Yazov, M.A. Moiseyev, P.G. Lushev, K.A. Kochetov, N.I. Shlyaga, Yu.P. Maksimov, B.I. Varennikov, I.M. Tretyak, Ye.I. Shaposhnikov, V.N. Chernavin, V.M. Shuralev, V.M. Arkhipov, V.P. Mironov, V.A. Achalov, N.V. Chekov, V.L. Govorov, V.F. Yermakov, Yu.A. Yashin, S.L. Sokolov, S.F. Akhromeyev, V.G. Kulikov, N.V. Ogarkov, V.I. Petrov, I.A. Gerasimov, S.P. Ivanov, P.I. Ivashutkin, Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, V.N. Babyev, V.V. Vorobyev, A.I. Ulyanchuk, S.A. Korennoy, S.S. Kondrashov, V.F. Medvedenko, N.M. Bay, Yu.V. Yeremenko, P.I. Kuchma, A.I. Kotlyar, A.V. Tishin.

Baltic Republics

OMON Detains Lithuanian Defense Chief

Landsbergis Reports Arrest

LD1803105991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0910 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Statement by Vytautas Landsbergis on 18 March; place not given—recorded]

[Text] Today again we have an attack by the [words indistinct] gang—one of a whole series of attacks. Earlier, police officials were attacked, or even non-alert drivers driving near their [special militia] headquarters. During the night they arrested [Supreme Council] deputy and general director of the country's defense department, Audrius Butkevicius, and his driver and they have not been released so far.

[Words indistinct] These questions are being investigated by our police and [word indistinct] Commissar Liubertas and also Deputy Prime Minister Zigmas Vaisvila, who have contacted high Moscow institutions. [words indistinct] and already several hours ago, [words indistinct] were told by telephone, that everything had been agreed concerning this matter and that they would be released immediately. However, as you can see, they have not yet been released. It is possible that we have been deceived once again.

We hope that in one way or another the situation will be clarified and [passage indistinct]

I asked General (Ikhnikov) by telephone whether he is responsible for these new actions and do they fall under his jurisdiction. He replied that they are under his jurisdiction, but since 0200 [1200 GMT] he has handed the entire matter over to Procurator Petrauskas sent here from Moscow. Thus, supposedly, it is no longer his concern. And how he assesses—in answer to the question whether he supports Bakutinovicius' actions—General (Ikhnikov) replied that it must be (?investigated).

Apparently, the order prevailing within the Soviet Army is as we are familiar with, is once more confirmed—a direct supervisor does not have sufficient authoritiy to give an order to his subordinate, whom he supports, or else a double policy is being carried out, and the sponsorship of this type of gang has not been invented locally.

We have reason to think that way and to [word indistinct] like that. To think that there exists a destabilization plan in Lithuania and they happen to make use of this armed detachment. Sometimes they try to make it seem that it will remain nonjurisdictional, as was done in Riga, while sometimes they [words indistinct] allow them to obtain some money, by allowing them to recruit people and involve them in criminal actions. That constitutes a very dangerous policy. Let us hope the danger will be understood finally.

On the other hand, let us hope that we will have sufficient strength and will not allow them to destabilize the situation by any sort of provocations, in accordance with how it is planned there.

I think it would be worth your while to show some interest in this matter, in about an hour or so.

Defense Chief Released

LD1803121491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1050 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] Another briefing has just taken place at the Supreme Council building. Supreme Council press representative Audrius Azubalis informed all about the most up to date news concerning the night's events, already familiar to all. So, we present the recording for you:

[Begin recording] [Azubalis] I can only state that at 1214 [1014 GMT] the chairman [Landsbergis] received a telephone call from the Lithuanian Republic's general procurator, Arturas Paulauskas who informed him that at the time of his call, the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] forces released general director of the country's defense department, Audrius Butkevicius. He is at the government building right now. So far, the automobile has not been returned and the general director's driver, Vaclovas [name indistinct] has also not been released. According to their explanation, they have been retained for further investigation.

Why did this entire release procedure take so long, four or five hours on this most recent occasion? Apparently, a portion of the blame falls on the pretender procurator, sent to us by a foreign state, that is, Petrauskas, who is representing the nonexistent Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. This matter was dragged out, not without his influence.

I can also add that the pistols which were in the possession of esteemed Butkevicius and his driver, officially and legally, have also not been returned, and will not be returned, according to the pretender prosecutor, Petrauskas. He is supposedly carrying out the orders of the Soviet Union's president, to confiscate all weapons. [passage indistinct] [end recording]

TASS Reports Detention

LD1803163891 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Vilnius March 18 TASS—Members of the USSR Interior Ministry's special-purpose militia squad, known as OMON for its Russian acronym, Whose task was to ensure the transportation of papers pertaining to the USSR referendum, temporarily detained Audrius Butkevicius, general director of the Territorial Protection Department of Lithuania, last night.

According to OMON men, Butkevicius, who was riding in a car together with a car driving guard, tried to drive through a militia cordon.

When documents were checked, it turned out that the car which, according to the guard and the director himself, belonged to the Territorial Protection Department had plate numbers of a car which is on the wanted list.

During an inspection of the car, OMON men found three pistols and ammunition. Neither Butkevicius nor the driver produced any documents concerning the weapons. The two detained men were brought to the Vilnius OMON headquarters where attempts were made to get explanations from them.

Butkevicius and his driver were questioned by the procurator of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the procurator of the Lithuanian Republic. Then Butkevicius as a people's deputy of the republic was released and had all papers returned to him. His driver and guard remains in detention so far.

Butkevicius Discusses Arrest

LD1803215791

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian at 1245 GMT on 18 March carries a 32-minute news conference with Audrius Butkevicius, general director of the Territorial Protection Department of Lithuania, at an unidentified location in Vilnius. The news conference is suspended after seven minutes, resuming at 1500 GMT.

At 1245 GMT Butkevicius recounts details of his arrest last night by the Special Purpose Militia Detachment, OMON, and the charges of transporting weapons lodged against him.

At 1258 GMT the announcer says Butkevicius has interrupted the news conference to meet with Landsbergis, but will return soon to continue the news conference.

Following a pause, representative Audrius Azubalis says the news conference will resume at 1415 GMT.

The news conference resumes at 1500 GMT. Butkevicius repeats his account of his arrest and answers reporters' questions.

Butevicius says: "Threatening us with automatic weapons, they demanded that we get out of the car. Then they called out this command: Hands on the hood. Feet apart! Disregarding my protest and my explanation that I am a Supreme Council deputy and that deputy immunity applies to me, we were rudely checked and searched. Finally, we were placed in an OMON car, with our hands in handcuffs, and taken to the so-called OMON base, or the former training base of the police academy.

"One of the pretexts used was the service weapon found on my driver which he had the right to carry in conformance with the country's defense service regulation.

"An accusation was also produced suggesting that our automobile number plates were false and were on the wanted list.

"While on the base, we encountered a whole series of provocations. We were confronted with arms and ammunition, supposedly discovered in our car. In addition, with other military equipment, for instance, a gas mask, a tank troop helmet and similar objects, a simply absurd collection, that had nothing in common and cannot have anything in common with objects that had been in my car.

"In spite of my protests I was repeatedly searched. Procurator Petrauskas did not charge me officially.

"They kept me on the OMON base until 2200, totally failing to react to my repeated demands to contact the government of the republic procuracy, to whom alone I could submit my evidence, as a citizen of the Republic of Lithuania and a Supreme Council deputy."

Butkevicius notes that only after the authorities of the Republic of Lithuania intervened was he given the chance to explain what had happened. He says: "The status which was applied to me was that of a doctor and this is written down in the record of evidence. But despite this, the car, documents and personal belongings have not been returned."

Butkevicius then answers questions. A journalist asks why Butkevicius was travelling at such a late hour and without personal protection. He answers: "I live in the Republic of Lithuania and any of my activities are legal and based on the laws of the republic. Therefore, I do not have to hide from anyone or run away from anyone. Only those who act illegaly in the Republic of Lithuania must hide."

A journalist asks what measures were taken to punish those who had executed this action and if this could be linked with the meeting with USSR Interior Minister Boris Pugo which took place last Saturday and his assurances that an alternative militia would not be operating in Lithuania and that a path to normalize the situation would be found. Butkevicious responds: "I have already appealed to the procutator of the republic and I think that everything will be done what needs to be done so that the culprits are punished." He adds: "It is clear that attempts are being made to destabilize the situation in Lithuania. One possible variant is to make the republic's defense system confront units such as OMON. Similar action, according to those who organized it, could lead to bloodshed. Then the inccident could be widely expanded and all this would allow the imposition of presidential rule, or some other laws of the Soviet Union in Lithuania. I think that this was a well-planned, deliberate political provocation, the aim of which is also clear."

Butkevicius also says: "It goes without saying that this provocation was planned. When we got out of the car we noticed that people with video cameras rushed towards

us ready to record everything on film. Later, when we were on the OMON base, we were filmed all the time. Readiness for propaganda work was evident. When we were taken to the OMON base citizen Shurupov was waiting for me, and immediately stated urging me to confess what I was intending to do with these weapons."

"You maintain that a new series of actions against the independence of Lithuania will start this week. What grounds did you have for maintaining this," a journalist asks.

Butkevicius replies: "First of all, about the information about provocations which are being prepared. As you can see, I personally became the victim of one such provocation."

Arrest Well-Planned 'Provocation'

LD1903083691 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 19 Mar 91

[Text] Vilnius March 19 TASS—Director-General of the Lithuanian Defence Department Audrius Butkevicius called his arrest and detention early on Monday a "well-planned political provocation" at a news conference here.

The Soviet Interior Ministry special task force, which was charged with transporting Soviet referendum documents in Vilnius, temporarily detained Director-General of the Lithuanian Defence Department Audrius Butkevicius early on Monday.

According to information supplied by the task force, Butkevicius, who drove in a car together with a bodyguard-chauffeur, tried to cross a checkpoint.

While their documents were being checked, it turned out that the car, in which they drove, was listed as stolen. Three pistols and ammunition were found in the car. Neither Butkevicius nor his driver had documents for the pistols.

The detained were brought to the base of the Vilnius special task force, where officials demanded an explanation.

Butkevicius and his driver were questioned by a prosecutor of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic and by a prosecutor of the Lithuanian Republic (appointed by Lithuanian authorities).

Then Butkevicius, a deputy to the Lithuanian parliament, was released. His driver is still in custody.

Butkevicius admitted that he and his driver had arms, for which "they had rights as Lithuanian Defence Department officers".

He said that a "provocation was made at the special task force base: Ammunition, weapons and other things were found in their car at the special task force base", which, he alleged, were deliberately planted in the car.

Butkevicius said that he was released by task force officers at about 10:00 on Monday and that "no official charge was made against him".

He also noted that he requested the Lithuanian procurator-general to institute criminal proceedings against those responsible for the incident.

Landsbergis Views Yeltsin, Gorbachev, Army

AU1903085991 Vienna PROFIL in German 18 Mar 91 p 54

[Interview with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis by Michael Siegert in Vilnius; date not given: "Revolution Is Necessary"]

[Text] [Siegert] President Landsbergis, what do you expect from the showdown between Yeltsin and Gorbachev?

[Landsbergis] This is not a competition between the two men, it is a conflict between two social and political concepts. On the one side there is the possibility that in the Soviet Union a government chosen by the people will implement democracy, the market economy, and human rights; on the other side there is a totalitarian regime that does not respect the will of the people and wants to keep everything in its own hands.

[Siegert] Thus, you are placing your trust in Yeltsin?

[Landsbergis] Not in Yeltsin as a person. It is a question of the goals and of the distribution of power.

[Siegert] What happens if Yeltsin is deposed by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic at the 28 March session, the people protest against this, and the Army crushes such a movement?

[Landsbergis] Yes, this might happen, and it might lead to a revolution.

[Siegert] Thus, you believe that your cause will win in the end, even if at first the military intervenes?

[Landsbergis] It is not only our cause. This revolution is necessary at present.

[Siegert] This presupposes that the Russian people will also rise up as the Lithuanian people have already done.

[Landsbergis] Sooner or later, yes. No people can live in oppression forever.

[Siegert] In Yugoslavia the Army is currently trying to come to power. Could this be an example for the Soviet Army?

[Landsbergis] The Soviet Army does not need anything like that. It is the worst example itself.

[Siegert] In everything that the Soviet Union has done here, it did keep within certain limits. It lifted the economic blockade of last summer again and it is not

trying to catch the recruits who do not report for military service. What keeps the Soviet Army from doing the utmost?

[Landsbergis] It has not made these concessions voluntarily, like the withdrawal from central Europe. These are no presents from Santa Claus.

[Siegert] The Army continually pricks you with needles. It arrests and mistreats people from your surroundings. Do you expect further acts of violence?

[Landsbergis] Yes, of course. They are continuously terrorizing us and are waging a psychological war. This might turn into an insidious occupation, where they increasingly take over control and their regime becomes increasingly harsher, so that the world gets gradually used to that. These provocations may cause a defense reaction at any moment. Then they will attack us with all their military power and claim that we were the first ones to attack. This is precisely what happened in Finland in 1939 and in our country in 1940.

[Siegert] What were your differences of opinion with head of government Kazimiera Prunskiene, who resigned in January? Was she for negotiations with Gorbachev while you were against such negotiations?

[Landsbergis] I also talked with Mr. Gorbachev and I believe that we can come to an agreement. But you know what the answer was in January. The difference with Mrs. Prunskiene was that she wanted a moratorium on our declaration of independence. On the eve of the negotiations this was a very dangerous political position. The Supreme Council of Lithuania chose another way: The moratorium should come into force after the official beginning of the negotiations—negotiations between two states and not between one state and its province.

[Siegert] If you could have negotiations with Mr. Gorbachev today, what would you tell him?

[Landsbergis] I would tell him the same thing that I told him last June: Let us put an end to the legacy of Stalin's crimes, which oppresses and tortures both our countries.

[Siegert] Do you think that the Kremlin will release the Baltic states at some time in the future?

[Landsbergis] This may happen if a new way of political thinking develops there, a really new way of thinking; or if the Kremlin itself collapses under the burden of its mistakes and crimes.

[Siegert] For that it would have to be shaken up energetically by the people first.

[Landsbergis] We are a small country, we cannot move such a big country. But on our side of the barricade there is a movement of people who are filled with great hopes.

[Siegert] Mr. President, you have been staying in the legislature building for two months without any break—how do you manage that?

[Landsbergis] I have not yet thought about that. I cannot leave because of my work. For me it is more comfortable to sleep here.

[Siegert] How do you feel?

[Landsbergis] If I get enough sleep I am well.

Latvian CP's Rubiks on 'Civil War' Risk

PM1403111891 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 6 Mar 91 p 1

[Interview with Alfreds Rubiks, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, by GLASNOST correspondent Eduard Krustkaln, attributed to GLASNOST issue No 9; place, date of interview not given: "Alfreds Rubiks: 'We Sought the Road to Talks, They Erected Barricades...'"]

[Text] [Krustkaln] What in your opinion are the reasons for current events in the republic?

[Rubiks] Latvia is witnessing a political—so far—struggle for power, which moreover is open and relentless. Our opponents, for their own purposes, are trying to interpret it as a form of interethnic conflict, but nothing can mask the specifically political nature of this confrontation and the extreme polarization of social forces. On one side there is the coalition proclaimed by the Latvian Communist Party favoring a sovereign Latvia within the context of a renewed federation. The other side comprises those who unite under the aegis of the Latvian People's Front, striving by hook or by crook to take the republic out of the USSR. These forces are more or less equal.

[Krustkaln] Why then does the Latvian People's Front hold a majority in the Latvian Supreme Soviet?

[Rubiks] There are many reasons for this. Errors on our part for one thing. Also of some import was the Communist Party's renunciation of its monopoly on information, allowing the Latvian People's Front to establish control over newspapers, radio, and TV, and to create its own ideological monopoly. Other "operations" by the People's Front also had an effect. Take for example the creation of electoral districts containing varying numbers of voters. Candidate deputies from the Latvian People's Front, including the majority of its leaders, were elected in sparsely populated rural areas. In Riga and in other cities, where Latvian Communist Party candidates stood a better chance of winning, enlarged districts were set up. As a result, our opponents won two-thirds of the seats in the Supreme Soviet even though they got only 35.3 percent of the vote overall. Therefore, they have no moral right to speak on behalf of the majority of the inhabitants of Latvia.

Basic deception played a vital role in capturing the voters' support. At the time when the Latvian People's Front was mouthing support for perestroyka and the

democratization of our society and backing M.S. Gorbachev's policy, they were in fact preparing to annul the "unlawful marriage"—as one of the Latvian People's Front leaders called Latvia's entry into the USSR in 1940.

Nevertheless, we took our seats in parliament and created the "Equal Rights" ["Ravnopraviye"] faction in the Supreme Soviet. Our deputies tried to initiate constructive dialogue with the majority faction and made use of the parliamentary platform to bring their views to the people—debates were broadcast on the radio and television. But cooperation with the "Equal Rights" faction was rejected and live radio and television broadcasts from the Supreme Soviet sessions were simply brought to a halt.

In the fall, the Latvian People's Front forced through innovations which are unprecedented in legislative practice. Now it is possible to alter the constitution and adopt laws by a simple majority vote, while Supreme Soviet resolutions can be adopted by one-third of the votes. Given that the "Equal Rights" faction holds a total of just 60 seats out of 201, the majority can now adopt any decision it chooses.

The announcement about coordinating the activities of the Supreme Soviet majority faction and the congress of Latvian citizens, whose activities were at one time regarded as unconstitutional, was the final straw. The alliance that has been formed is in fact tantamount to a legislative coup. As a sign of protest, the "Equal Rights" faction walked out of the Supreme Soviet and started holding its own sessions separately.

[Krustkaln] And then the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation came into being....

[Rubiks] There is no point in making a bugaboo of that. First you have to find out why it emerged and what it was interested in. The All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation is the direct descendant of the Committee for the Defense of Citizens' Rights and the Constitutions of the USSR and the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. The latter was created 20 May 1990 by representatives of the public. This was a legitimate reaction to the Latvian Supreme Soviet's 4 May Declaration of Independence and its rejection of the USSR presidential decree proclaiming that act unconstitutional and subject to repeal.

When social confrontation increased in the republic last year, the Committee for the Defense of Citizens' Rights held its second congress. People's deputies from all levels and 2,227 delegates elected from practically every region and city in Latvia took part in it. The Committee for the Defense of Citizens' Rights was renamed the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation because the republic is witnessing not just violations of people's constitutional rights but of their other rights, too. The committee is comprised of approximately 80 individuals.

[Krustkaln] What are the tasks facing the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation?

[Rubiks] Pretty much the same as the ones facing the Committee for the Defense of Citizens' Rights: To defend citizens' rights from any encroachments.

[Krustkaln] In what way?

[Rubiks] For example, the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation receives anyone who thinks their rights are being violated. Complaints are investigated by qualified lawyers working on a voluntary basis. Materials are then prepared and sent to the Latvian SSR Prosecutor's Office and decisions are made on that basis. True, there is another prosecutor's office in the republic, but nevertheless we have helped many people, although of course not all.

In addition, All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation lawyers examine laws and resolutions being adopted in the republic and other acts to ensure that they comply with international human rights documents and the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions. In all, over 20 documents have been studied, and the results have been analyzed and sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet, and individual excerpts have been published in the press.

[Krustkaln] What was the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation's role in the January events in Riga?

[Rubiks] A strike movement erupted at the beginning of January after numerous price increases for food products, transport, and municipal services. The emerging situation was discussed 9 January at a meeting of representatives from organizations supporting the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions. On the strike committees' initiative, it was decided to picket the republic council of ministers building the next day. Around 50,000 people gathered. After an hour, I. Godmanis, head of the government, came out of the building and was handed a petition. It contained a demand to suspend the decision on price increases and the validity of laws violating human rights, and to offer the opposition a chance to put their views to the population on radio and television (currently dominated by the Latvian People's Front). Should these demands not be met, the government and supreme soviet were called upon to resign and call immediate elections.

All the demands were dismissed outright on the evening of 10 January in speeches by I. Godmanis and the head of the legislature, A. Gorbunovs. It became clear that the authorities were ignoring all opinions except their own.

Next, the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation and the strike committees announced [passage indistinct] tens of thousands of people from all over Latvia gathered at the Army Sports Club Stadium. They demanded that the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation take responsibility for maintaining law and order and resolving power questions. This was agreed to in a political statement by the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation. At the same time, the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation refrained from practical action and steadfastly sought a road to talks with the

authorities. But our opponents set about putting up barricades. On strict orders from the Latvian People's Front, their "defenders" and builders along with the equipment came mainly from the countryside. The government gave them money and free food and drink, and they were extremely aggressively disposed.

Meanwhile, a thorough hunt for special militia members was organized and conducted by paramilitary detachments of the "law and order guardians" broken up into groups of five. With the connivance of the republic leadership and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] leaders, someone managed to precipitate the 20 January events at the MVD building.

Immediately, and without any grounds, the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation was held responsible for the events. The committee rejected these hollow accusations there and then.

[Krustkaln] But the committee's activities and its very existence are unconstitutional....

[Rubiks] This is not quite so. First, in line with the Latvian SSR and USSR Constitutions, working people are entitled to set up their own organizations. Second, the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation is just one of many social and political organizations which are not registered in Latvia because there is no legal requirement to do so.

Of course, the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation statement in the political declaration on assuming power functions before the new elections is not constitutional. Although this part of the political statement was suspended soon after. But this does not mean that the authorities or even the legislature can violate the Latvian SSR or USSR Constitutions or ignore presidential decrees.

[Krustkaln] How will the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation react if the government and the Latvian Supreme Soviet continue with the previous policy?

[Rubiks] Its reaction depends on decisions by organizations forming part of the committee. I think that if the unpopular policy continues to be implemented, then a fresh upsurge in the strike movement is likely. How else can the authorities be forced to come to the negotiating table?

[Krustkaln] It is well known that the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation and other organizations are calling for the introduction of presidential rule in Latvia. What do you think of this measure?

[Rubiks] This measure is tough for everyone. Presidential rule must be introduced when people's rights or indeed their lives are in jeopardy. Clearly it involves limiting certain rights and freedoms of citizens and the activities of social organizations and parties, and controlling the media. But if we do not want presidential rule to be introduced, then we must not exacerbate the situation. We must talk and achieve agreement. Unfortunately, our opponents are not too keen on this approach and are playing a double game.

[Krustkaln] What do you mean by "double game"?

[Rubiks] 22 January, the president met with A. Gorbunovs and invited me along to the meeting. And then A. Gorbunovs concealed one of the understandings that had been achieved, to say nothing of the fact that he never mentioned my presence at the meeting.

[Passage indistinct] the president, who had his official representative there for liaison purposes. The commission was tasked with analyzing the legislative acts adopted in Latvia so that at its behest the legislature itself could abolish or suspend those which contradict the Latvia SSR or USSR Constitutions and the presidential decrees.

Through the fault of the deputies' majority, the commission was not set up. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we solve the legislative problem despite our opponents' reluctance.

[Krustkaln] Will there be civil war in Latvia?

[Rubiks] I am convinced that this can be avoided by introducing presidential rule. I am also convinced that it will have to be introduced sooner or later. The rival sides are so strong and their aspirations so conflicting that it is extremely difficult to pacify them. Neither the Latvian Communist Party nor the All-Latvia Committee for Public Salvation is to blame. They neither have nor need armed detachments. They support compliance with the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions and presidential decrees, and the solving of all problems via talks and the referendum. But the republic's incumbent leaders think otherwise. Under the political diktat of the Latvian People's Front, the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions are not observed and the presidential decrees of the USSR are declared null and void on Latvian territory. I. Bisers, first deputy chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers, directs the detachments of "guardians of law and order." D. Ivans, first deputy chairman of the republic supreme soviet, announced that the Latvian Republic categorically rejects the possibility of organizing the referendum on its territory in accordance with the USSR law. He also announced that the barricade guards had been ordered to open fire in the event of military force being used against them. Likewise, D. Ivans acknowledged the existence in the republic of armed militants—indeed, it is they who man the barricades. Is this really not a step toward civil war?

Burokevicius Views Lithuanian CP's Role

PM1903103091 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Professor M. Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, by Captain 2d Rank V. Gromak under the

"Topical Interview" rubric; date and place of interview not given: "'You Cannot Destroy the Lithuanian Communist Party'"]

[Text] [Gromak] Mykolas Martinovich, it looks as if Lithuanian legislators and the republic government have fully focused their attention on political questions. Meanwhile, the Lithuanian economy is falling into neglect. Won't a once developed republic turn into an economic disaster region?

[Burokevicius] The economic position of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] is currently very complex. The fact is that the present Lithuanian leadership has embarked on a separatist course and has taken significant steps to disengage the economy of Lithuania as a union republic from the economy of the Union. This disengagement results in economic shake-ups. Today the republic's economy is developing with considerable difficulties. One of the reasons for this is that republic enterprises no longer have contractual ties with the enterprises outside the borders of the republic which supply components and raw materials.

On the whole, our republic is poorly endowed with sources of raw materials. But our industry is very complex and highly developed. And since it did not have a raw material base in Lithuania, it was always supplied centrally from other union republics. The Lithuanian Council of Ministers has virtually severed all ties with the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and with Union economic departments. And now our enterprises are not centrally supplied with raw materials and semifinished products. The separatist policy of the republic Supreme Soviet and government has resulted in an exodus of many good specialists from the republic. From Mazeikiai, for example. There is a large petrochemical complex there, you know. A group of top-caliber specialists is intending to quit Snieckus. Then the republic's power generation system will fall apart.

Or take agriculture. Generally speaking, until recently it was in top place in the Union. Now, because of pandering to political ambitions, what fed Lithuania only yesterday is being destroyed. Kolkhozes are under attack. But, you know, it is a fact that the kolkhoz structure has actually taken root in Lithuania. And strong kolkhozes, even those where the leaders are Sajudis members, oppose the foolish policy of the legislature and government. The foolish agrarian policy is also opposed by churchmen. In Kedainiai there is a priest—Father Stanislavas. He has condemned the thoughtless abolition of kolkhoz forms of economic management both on republic television and at the peasants' congress in December. Generally speaking, this congress declared a position on agriculture that is the opposite of parliament's position. A considerable number of farmers are also unhappy with this agrarian policy. After all, the government gives them no help. They are turning to the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee so that we can help the farmers through the Lithuanian Association of Free Entrepreneurs.

[Gromak] Shortly before our meeting a large group of people came to you. As I understand it, these were representatives of Vilnius transportation enterprises. Are you able to reveal what brought them to the office of the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee?

[Burokevicius] Very great difficulties can be observed in the transportation system. This is due to the fact that the present Lithuanian leadership and local self-government bodies are guided not by economic laws, but proceed from parochial and mercenary considerations. And a number of collectives have been split, particularly in Vilnius, along ethnic lines. And so the enterprise representatives whom you saw in the waiting room were indignant at Sajudis members' desire to dismiss good specialists for the sole reason that they are Communists and Russians. But there are instances of Sajudis forces coming out against educated specialists not just of Russian nationality, but also Lithuanians and Poles. This means a social question is involved here. All those who do not support the present Lithuanian leadership are being kept out of leadership work. The Lithuanian leadership is interested not so much in the problems linked with getting out of the economic crisis as in justifying its separatist politics, the essence of which is secession from the USSR. With full confidence, therefore, I can draw this conclusion: The economic policy of the present Lithuanian leadership both in the industrial sphere and in agriculture and transportation has an antinational flavor and has nothing in common with the interests of Lithuania's working people.

[Gromak] A war of laws is practically being fought in Lithuania. All Soviet laws are being disclaimed, the Lithuanian SSR Constitution has been abolished, and the validity of the USSR Constitution has been suspended. Under the Law on Political Parties, the Lithuanian Communist Party has been outlawed. The Lithuanian parliament has inserted an addendum into the criminal code, as a result of which Communists risk punishment for political activity up to and including the death penalty...

[Burokevicius] It is impossible to destroy the Lithuanian Communist Party, because it is part and parcel of the working people. Even Hitler and his hirelings—the Lithuanian bourgeois nationalists—were unable to destroy it. Lithuanian Communists, who number approximately 40,000, are people driven by an idea. All the careerists went off with Brazauskas to the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party. But those who stayed on have one privilege—they are constantly hounded and subjected to moral terror. At a meeting of party activists 17 February, many speakers cited incidents of physical reprisals against Lithuanian Communist Party members.

But it is cheering to see that there is no panic among Communists today, and all party organization structures have been preserved.

We Communists are prepared to make compromises, and are striving for mutual understanding between social movements and a strengthening of normal human relations in our native region. But there are questions that divide Communists and separatists deeply. We are in favor of the development of an autonomous, independent, and sovereign Lithuanian State within the USSR. They want the development of Lithuania outside the Union. We are in favor of developing the republic in a socialist direction, the separatists want to follow a capitalist course; we favor full democratization of life in Lithuania and equality for all before the Constitution, regardless of political convictions and nationality, while the separatists want the introduction of a regime (and it has practically been introduced) which advocates a single development blueprint—the development of Lithuania along capitalist lines outside the USSR. Everything else, in the opinion of this regime, is to be outlawed.

And the most hurtful thing is that former Communists who are now Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party members turn out to be fierce defenders of the capitalist direction of Lithuanian development outside the Union. It turns out that as early as December 1989 they thought they would part ways with the "criminal Kremlin." In its 12 February 1991 issue, the newspaper TIESA published a document by the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party (Brazauskas) Presidium Council that was filled with hatred toward the leadership of the country and the Communist Party. The document states: "As early as December 1989 the democratically minded majority of the Lithuanian Communist Party, now the Democratic Labor Party, feeling that the center was using Communists as a cover for and an instrument of its black deeds, resolutely severed all bonds linking it with the criminal Kremlin."

In relation to the Lithuanian Communist Party it stated: "The monologue of strength and cruelty is continuing, the apologists of bloody reprisal continue to maintain that the business that has been started 'must be followed through to victory.' In these acts of intimidation and violence the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) has been assigned the role of quisling..."

Here, when they talk about a monologue of strength and cruelty, they mean the central authority and the Soviet Army, and I think that this statement by the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party constitutes a major display of disrespect toward the USSR president, who, incidentally, received this party's representatives at the beginning of February.

[Gromak] Mykolas Martinovich, the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party Presidium Council's statement with regard to the Soviet Armed Forces is really quite mild. The Lithuanian legislature, the government, and the Sajudis press spare no mud when it comes to army and navy servicemen. From words they proceed to direct physical assaults on soldiers and officers. How do you react to all this?

[Burokevicius] First, the USSR Armed Forces are the guarantor of the territorial integrity of the Lithuanian socialist state within the USSR. Second, the Soviet Army (I am sure of this) enjoys very great prestige among by far the largest section of the Lithuanian population. Ordinary people have a great deal of respect for the soldier, the officer, and the general. Everyone understands that if the Soviet Army had not defeated the Nazis, it is doubtful whether Lithuania would exist today as a state, and therefore, I repeat once again, the vast majority of people living in the republic have a respectful attitude to servicemen.

But the Lithuanian nationalists and separatists have a kind of animal hatred toward the Soviet Army. We think that the antiarmy hysteria they have promoted is part of their psychological war against the USSR. The Lithuanian Communist Party has great respect for servicemen. We cooperate with military-political bodies. This cooperation is a necessary condition for fostering in the citizens of Lithuania a respectful attitude and humanitarian feelings toward Soviet servicemen.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Chairs 15 Mar Supreme Soviet Presidium

LD1503202091 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The latest session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium took place in the RSFSR House of Soviets today. The session was chaired by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and by Comrade Isayev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The issue of additional measures for speeding up land reform in the RSFSR was discussed at the session. A decision was adopted on granting local soviets of people's deputies—for the rest of this year—the right to make decisions on the withdrawal of land plots and granting them to citizens or collectives for the creation of peasant farm holdings and the introduction of private plots, horticulture, market gardening, and animal husbandry. Local soviets of people's deputies and the bodies of the RSFSR State Committee for Land Reform are tasked with providing for the allocation of land plots to all who want them by 15 April of this year.

The meeting discussed RSFSR draft laws on providing citizens of the RSFSR with the means to pay for the acquisition of state property, on the setting up of a state committee for federal property of the RSFSR and bodies of the federation's subjects for the administration of RSFSR state property, on the demonopolization or

privatization of property in the RSFSR, and on making amendments to the RSFSR law on state pensions in the RSFSR. It was decided to submit these for consideration by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

It was also decided to perpetuate the memory of those who died while protecting the fatherland or while carrying out military duty. A clause on a plenipotentiary representative of the emergency commission on foodstuffs of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies was approved.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium revoked decisions by the Ryazan and Tambov Oblast Soviets of People's Deputies on not holding the RSFSR referendum as being contrary to Articles 2, 5, and 109 of the RSFSR Constitution.

Other issues relating to the republic's state life were also considered at the session.

PRAVDA Cites Yeltsin Discrepancies on Issues

PM1803115791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Ye. Sorokin under the "Well, Well!" rubric: "It Turns Out That He Did Sign..."]

[Text] Of late the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has been beset by embarrassing situations. First there was the "bugging" affair, which proved... easy to deflate. Then the price hikes for luxury goods which were coordinated with Boris Nikolayevich, although he categorically denied this. Here is another—also recent—episode. Deputies spent virtually a whole day arguing during a closed Russian legislature session as to whether or not their chairman should sign the document on price hikes which the prime minister had put forward. They argued until they were hoarse. Yet it turned out that Boris Nikolayevich had already refused to sign and legislative debates were not necessary in the least.

Here is another extraordinary thing. Speaking recently at Cinema House, B. Yeltsin claimed that the president had deceived people by saying that the draft Union treaty has been 90-percent agreed. "Khasbulatov, leader of the working group, did not sign on Russia's behalf. That's hocus-pocus."

Yet issue No 63 of IZVESTIYA provided an official correction from which it is clear that R. Khasbulatov did sign his copy of the protocol during the actual work of the Federation Council. You can only gesture helplessly after this report...

PRAVDA Reprints BILD Yeltsin Interview

PM1903092991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 91 Second Edition p 6

[Reprint of Hamburg BILD interview with Boris N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, under the "Ours on Us" rubric and the general heading: "Opinion for Export"]

[Text] BILD (FRG) has published an interview with B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet.

[BILD] Mr. Yeltsin, will you put forward your candidacy for the post of USSR president?

[Yeltsin] No, under no circumstances. Russia's enough for me.

[BILD] Do you have any real alternatives to Gorbachev's policy?

[Yeltsin] Of course.

[BILD] What are they?

[Yeltsin] First, a new version of the "500 days" program, which is currently being formulated. Second, Gorbachev wants to have a strong center and weak republics. He wants to keep this system and I want to destroy it. That's our fundamental difference. I favor strong republics with a center without a president—a center that would just perform the functions of a coordinating center: The Federation Council could possibly be that. Republic leaders should resolve all problems.

[BILD] If Gorbachev rang at your door tonight, what would you do?

[Yeltsin] I would invite him in. His first question would be: "Shall we make up?" And my reply would be: "It's too late. You've missed the boat. I suggested that three years ago." I advised him then to rely on left-wing forces, but he allowed right-wing forces to rise up, and now they are criticizing him and will probably overthrow him, too. But he would most likely not ask about reconciliation. At any rate he would like to make sure that I do not aspire to his post. But I have already said on several occasions that I do not want to be an alternative to him. There is a very great deal to do here in Russia. I would tell him: "Don't prevent us from doing it."

RSFSR Presidium Accelerates Land Reform

LD1803204191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 18 Mar 91

[Text] The editorial office today received the text of a decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation on additional measures to accelerate the implementation of land reform in the republic.

It reports in part that the decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation are being poorly implemented by the supreme soviets and councils of ministers of the Republic of Tatarstan, the Kabardino-Balkar Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Chuvash SSR, and by the soviets of people's deputies of Stavropol Kray and Astrakhan, Kursk, Lipetsk, Omsk, Orenburg, Rostov and an number of other oblasts.

The decision notes that executive committees and presidiums of local soviets of people's deputies are granted the right to decide on confiscating plots of land and giving them to citizens or collectives to set up peasant farms, to carry out private subsidiary farming, horticulture, vegetable and livestock farming, with the subsequent ratification of these decisions at sessions of soviets of people's deputies, and for the purpose of satisfying these needs, to take unused land from those with land tenure without their consent and, if need be, up to 10 percent of the area of agricultural land under their tenure.

Khasbulatov Holds News Conference

LD1803221691

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 1730 GMT on 18 March carries a six-minute report by correspondent Lyudmila Semina on a news conference in Moscow by Ruslan Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, supreme soviet.

Semina sums up the main topics of the news conference: the results of the Russian referendum and their implications, and also the forthcoming Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. Khasbulatov thinks that the idea of a Russian presidency is gaining support among the population. He described the agenda of the extraordinary congress: the political and economic situation in Russia, the Union treaty, and the federation treaty. He said that the RSFSR Government is developing a program for improving the RSFSR economy. Then Semina plays an excerpt from Khasbulatov's address:

Khasbulatov says: "We need reforms, primarily economic reforms. We must create a normal mixed market economy, we must create forces of competition. This means separating the economy from the state. Adam Smith was right in saying that the state should perform the function of a night watchman. The economy is a domain of people, enterpreneurs, and their collectives, and here the state should intervene only indirectly, through tax regulation. The sooner we liberate the economy from the clutches of state control, the more economic freedom citizens will have. The citizens' economic freedom also means their political independence and freedom. We need reforms of that kind.

"Unfortunately, the central administration has so far shown lack of wisdom and resoluteness required for implementing this process. I was astonished at the Federation Council when I heard everyone repeating the word: market. I asked them: Do you realize that a market means recognizing the principle of private ownership? No, they said, we will build a socialist market of our own, without private ownership. What is that? But the main thing is that these hesitations and unevenness of reform give rise to uncertainty among everyone in the world and among our people, too. Our people themselves do not understand and cannot be sure: All right, you adopted a law today, but tomorrow the president will adopt a new decree."

Khasbulatov mentions the decisions on the agrarian problem which were adopted at the Second Congress which are being thwarted by the central administration in various ways; therefore, changes in agriculture are proceeding too slowly. Treaties with individual republics are aimed at stabilizing the economic situation, he says.

Semina says there were questions about the disposition of forces at the forthcoming Congress. Another Khasbulatov recording is heard in which he expresses confidence in a sensible approach prevailing: "I have constantly offered cooperation to the Communists of Russia group: Come on, let us get together; what are you unhappy about? But no, they persist in merciless criticism, whereas a constructive approach or a desire to cooperate is absent. I think this is so because they have no program. But where could they get it from? If they failed to produce one after 73 years, how can they do it now, all of a sudden, from the same minds? At the same time there is no shortage of destructive programs, while creative ones are wanting.

"Of course, people are worried, including deputies, because after six months of our official administration, we have not attained any conspicuous successes, to put it mildly. I think that a serious discussion, a very serious one, on this account will be held at the congress. On the whole, I reckon we will become stronger after the congress," Khasbulatov concludes.

Silayev Answers Questions on Current Issues

LD1003142391 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 0815 GMT 10 Mar 91

[Studio interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Council of Ministers, by unidentified correspondents; from the "Video Channel Plus Eleven" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] We have in the studio Chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers Ivan Stepanovich Silayev. During the brief time that our telephone lines have been open, we have received very very many questions from you, esteemed TV viewers, various questions, and Ivan Stepanovich is ready to answer them. But before we start replying to questions, I would like Ivan Stepanovich to comment on the feature about leasehold farmer Nekrasov from Archangelsk which you and I

have just watched now. It seemed to me that in the statements which we heard, in the grievances against the state farm and against its inability, unwillingness, to hand over land, to some extent the common problems facing leasehold farmers have manifested themselves. So I will ask you to reply to leasehold farmer Nekrasov from Archangelsk and to comment in general terms on what he said and to tell us to what extent the issues are now as real and acute as this person raised them.

[Silayev] Thank you. Well, first and foremost, I should like to say that it is excellent that in a region which we count as part of the northern territories—and we say that living conditions there are generally very harsh—such interesting people, such enthusiasts as in particular Nekrasov emerge. I understand all what he said, all his grievances and fears, but at the same time his last cheerful words—we will not retreat, only go forward—this is, if you like, a reflection on the whole of the smallholders' movement in the Russian Federation. Of course, quite a few practical steps still need to be taken in order to ensure that the law on the land, on reform, is implemented in full measure in all corners of the Russian Federation. But already the fact itself that such people are appearing—and at present there already some 60,000 smallholders' farms are functioning in Russia, and some 10,000 applications are waiting to be examined—show that these processes are vigorously moving forward.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, I know that you have recently been in Samara, at a leasehold farmers' congress. How typical there were the problems which the leasehold farmer from Archangelsk spoke of, in general for Russia's leasehold farmers, and could you tell us just a little about this congress of leasehold farmers?

[Silayev] Alright. Let me correct you slightly. This was not a congress of leasehold farmers, it was a meeting with collective farmers, with chairmen of collective farms, directors of state farms, leaders of Volga valley rayons. We held conversations connected with the food program and, of course, could not but touch on the problems of the leasehold farmers' movement, that is to say, in general we mean to give attention both to the collective farm and state farm principle of farming and also to the leasehold farm principle. A very interesting leasehold farmer spoke there: a former director of a state farm.

[Correspondent] He became a leasehold farmer?

[Silayev] Yes. For some time he was chairman of a rayon executive committee and, already taught by this experience and having become wiser from all that life had thrown at him, he became a leasehold farmer. Quite an active person. He made a very interesting address, and I understand in this situation the unpreparedness of our society, including also of the peasant society, to treat this as something which concerns us closely and which is necessary to us. They are very courageous people, persistent, but they of course need very great support. I want to tell both Comrade Nekrasov and others that we are determined to support this issue very seriously and where we see shortcomings, and Comrade Nekrasov mentioned them, we will of course rectify them.

Ending this part I should like to say, well, if you like, compare, the smallholders' movement to the spring flood, if an attempt is made to put up some barriers or dams in its way, then the spring flood washes away everything.

If we try to put barriers or dams in place, then the spring weather will destroy everything. But if everything follows good channels and its guided in the direction needed ... and in what direction? The single one—to feed the people, to give an opportunity for all forms of farming the land. Strictly speaking, all of us from the chairman of the council of ministers to local leaders should go along this channel, so that farmers can do their noble business.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, I will begin with a question from Moscow Oblast, from the town of Odintsovo. It is asked by Ivan Romanovich Konobasov and Vyacheslav Ivanovich Yakovlev. They deal directly with those problems which we have just been speaking about. What has been done in a practical sense by the Russian Government about implementing the land law adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet?

[Silayev] Well, first of all, the law itself was prepared by the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation. Then, after the adoption of the law, a number of practical documents were produced. These have now been conveyed to the local bodies of power. Specifically, we are simply now [changes thought] which path are we now taking? You said that we are in the Volga region on 12th, 14th and 15th. We will meet agrarian workers in Siberia as well. We will take an interest in and influence there the positions of the local leaders and the chairmen of collective farms in order to render the maximum assistance in the sphere, to the local movement. So we were here in the Moscow suburbs during the second half of the day yesterday, and issues of spring field work were also considered, and we met two very interesting state farm directors and of course we were surprised when one of the state farm directors said that we also have one private farmer here.

[Correspondent] Only one?

[Silayev] Yes, only one. So we felt that they do not believe that private farmers may within a short period of time find their feet and supplement the peasants' efforts. Well, if they do not believe in it, let them work within their own structures for the time being. We would very much like as many leaders of collective farms, of local soviet and rural farms as possible to actively help this movement. These are not their rivals, and even less their enemies. These, if you like, are their junior partners in the resolution of one and the same peasant tasks.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, it has in any case become traditional in our conversation to move from land, leasing and agricultural problems to prices. So here is a whole series of questions on prices. I would like to

combine them now and would put it like this. Eduard Borisovich Avakyan from Rostov asks: When will the game with prices come to an end? The leaders of state activities, communists, and the communist party know very well that the issues of inflation and stabilization and food for the people cannot be resolved by the invention of any old prices. Prices should be naturally determined by the plenitude of industrial and agrarian output. Serafim Aleksandrovna Demyanova: Why has the Russian Government still not signed anything on the raising of prices, when all this time Muscovites have been buying everything at high prices and without any kind of subsidy? Galina Fedorovna Fenogenova from Tselinograd: From which prices will the official rise in prices follow—from the increased or from the old ones? Well, let us...I think that there will be many questions more but these two or three general questions...

[Silayev, interrupting] Well, let us try. Yes, let us try. Well, first of all I will answer Galina Fedorovna Fenogenova that naturally the rise in prices, retail state prices, will be from the tariff prices valid today, not from those that are being introduced by local power bodies on some product or other at level some or other. So from the retail tariff prices existing until now. That is the first thing. The second thing is that it is not true that the Russian Government has not yet signed a general document on the transition to new prices. In general, I, personally, as the chairman of the Council of Ministers signed a document three weeks ago. Since this, additional elaborations relating to remarks by other republics have occurred and at the present time this document has been fully signed and evidentaly, literally over the next few days there will be a presidential decree on the beginning of the payment of compensation, as it has already been agreed that the rise in market prices, will be an increase and will be preceded by the payment of compensation in connection with the additional expenditure of the population. Well, and what is there here...

[Correspondent, interrupting] Well here is a long question from...

[Silayev, interrupting] Well, undoubtedly. After all, the change in prices, the rise in prices...there will be a new reintegration. It is not the source of an increase in prosperity, and moreover it cannot lead to complication or to certain deprivations. Consequently, the main thing is goods, the production of consumer goods in greater and greater numbers. In our plans for this year we have envisaged the maximum of assistance and economic support right up to freeing from taxation any enterprises that increase the production of consumer goods. We are going along this path.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, Lyubov Simonova Ryzhova from Yudina asks will the law on pensions in the RSFSR come into force from 1 January 1990? [as heard] Has the law on income tax in the RSFSR already come into force?

[Silayev] In accordance with a decision by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, this law comes into force from 1 March this year, and accordingly changes in payments should already be guaranteed.

[Correspondent] Here is a stern question from [first name indistinct] Semina from Moscow: Who could allow a tax of 5 percent to be taken from the people without the permission of the people?

[Silayev] Well, first of all, the taxes, the 5 percent sales tax, was introduced by a presidential decree and by a decision of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. We recently published—in connection with a multitude of questions, critical statements and reproaches directed at the Government of the Russian Federation—we published a large list of consumer goods that are not subject to the 5 percent taxes. This is practically the whole group of foodstuffs, children's goods, a number of everyday goods, and in addition to this we allowed the republics within the Russian Federation and the oblasts and krays to additionally withdraw this 5 percent tax from the list of goods which they consider necessary, at their own discretion and taking the local situation into account. That is, we have implemented a wide-ranging set of measures to protect people from additional expenditure. This was published a few days ago in the central press.

[Correspondent] Will the 42d decision of the RSFSR Council of Ministers be fulfilled with regard to invalids? That is, the transfer of enterprises to invalids. How will this be dealt with.

[Silayev] Well, if this is not being fulfilled, since Sergey Vasilyevich raises the question in this way, I simply appeal to the leaders of the local authorities. I think that it is not necessary to agitate to support the efforts of invalids, so that they can resolve their tasks independently. Therefore, I simply bind the executive bodies and ask all the rest to support the implementation of this decision.

[Correspondent] From Zelenograd. When will the RSFSR Government talk about the social protection of the public, especially of pensioners, indigents and children up to 16 years of age. And this request: Please be more specific.

[Silayev] Well, actually I have already dealt with this question. In the next few days, literally, decisions will be published on which a specific program for the protection of various social strata of the population, including those about which Galine Petrovna is talking, will be expanded. I would not want to spend time on this explaining its specifics.

In any case, these categories will of course be more reliably protected in the material we have prepared which will come into effect in the near future. Our protection of this group envisages 100 percent compensation for expenses incurred by this population group from price changes.

[Correspondent] From Moscow. How should the Union treaty be formulated, and will there be a referendum on Russia? Well, I should like to you talk a little on the role of Russia and the republic in the economic aspect of the Union treaty.

[Silayev] Well, I have already said, to answer your question, Yelena Vasilyevna, how we are interacting here with the Union republics. We are already working. The principle of direct interaction with all the republics is already being realized.

The mechanism of the organizaiton of our accords is already being put into force and, naturally, we, precisely all the republics, are in very great need of the realization by the Union treaty of the basic principles of the declarations proclaimed by all the Union republics. That is, sovereignty, and a high degree of economic independence in all the problems concerning tasks of the social development of every republic.

The center must retain a minimum of those functions which, according to a united treaty principle, will be handed over to the center. The published draft Union treaty includes certain points. One feels that quite a lot of work has been done. But it still requires serious elaboration and the execution of a number of remarks, such an issue as the independence, for example, of republics in foreign economic activity. In my opinion this is very unclear, incomprehensible, and I would even say ambiguous in the text of the draft. Thus, naturally, we are for the Union treaty which will allow our republic to independently resolve all its quesitons, including the use of natural resources, our scientific production potential—well, just as it is done in the modern world.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, we have here an unorthodox question. It is not from a television viewer, but came to us from Cheboksary. I would like us to look at it. The question is about the problems of the Cheboksary hydraulic junction. Please answer it.

[Silayev] I am acquainted...

[Begin recording] [Reporter Yevgeniy Nikonov] The Cheboksary hydraulic junction is located at the Volga-Kama crossroads and is therefore the busiest on the Volga. Up to 170,000 tonnes of cargo for the enterprises and shops of many of the country's towns are carried through the locks for shipping every day. It is difficult to envisage a cessation of its work, even for one day. But it is quite possible that such a thing could happen.

[A.V. Yanin, fitter] We have to set up a strike committee, so that it is in keeping with the law. We need a warning strike.

[Nikonov] This is the harsh conclusion which the collective of the Cheboksary rayon hydraulic installations is being pushed toward by the circumstances created by lies and irresponsibility. After 10 years of construction, in December 1990 the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrication put the locks into operation. But the Rosrechflot concern refused to accept them, having discovered major omissions which put a question mark over the accident-free working of the installations. The builders had already received a R2 million bonus for commissioning the site on time, and they bade farewell to the locks. Not prepared to pay the balance, Rosrechflot is also not capable of financing the work. As a result, people have not received their wages for months. The collective does not have funds for the repair and preparation of the mechanisms for shipping. By striking, they hope to remind people not only about themselves but also about the coming shipping season.

[P.G. Dolbikov, head of rayon hydraulic installations, Cheboksary] The circumstances are forcing us today. Because it is simply that no one wants to resolve this. We have appealed to the higher levels of the administration. We have appealed to Semenov, minister of power and electrication, the chairman of the Rosrechflot concern; Comrade Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; and Comrade Zaytsev, the chairman of the Chuvash Soviet Socialist Republic. I know that Zaytsev also sent telegrams to the Union Council of Ministers and the RSFSR Council of Ministers, but today the matter is not being dealt with. We have wandered from one level to another. No one wants to take on solving this.

[Nikonov] The river sailors saw transferring to self-financing as a way out, to take payment, as is done throughout the world, from the vessels sailing through. It works out at 8 kopecks per tonne of cargo. But this proposal of theirs was also not supported. The locks remain no one's property. Less than a month remains until the opening of the shipping season. [end recording]

[Correspondent] Well, how will you comment on and respond to this question?

[Silayev] Yes, I would divide the question into two parts.

First, this needs to be tackled the right way. Rivermen need to be given the opportunity to operate new economic structures, to have a high degree of independence. I am prepared to study this question and support it. Therefore—that is already the practical side of the matter. Let us investigate and find our what the delay is there. I consider that this is part and parcel of economic renewal.

As regards the overall problem of the Cheboksary hydro-complex, I do not consider that ballots, let alone strike threats, can resolve these questions. None of this is as simple as it might seem. After all, this is all directly connected with the all-Union energy program. Its compilation has been held up, and therefore, naturally, the question of the Cheboksary hydro-complex is not being resolved, either. But, in principle, I consider that the way the question is tackled, the lowering of the water level at this station is connected with, shall we say, the flooding of a large area of land, settlements and villages. This has

all happened already. We should not go to absurd lengths here, of course. There should be a certain optimum level here. But, I repeat, the organization of a ballot on this highly complicated question is not the right way to go about things. Generally speaking, of course, strikes do not strengthen our economy. Since the Russian Government has also already been criticized on this score, I invite the authors of these suggestions, I am willing to go over this whole question with them once again during the next few days.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, I have a copy of IZVESTIYA with me. It contains a transcript of the draft treaty on the union of sovereign republics. I would like to begin with a question from Comrade Snchekin from Kaliningrad. The question reads as follows—I will read it out: It refers to Article 7 about ownership. According to the article, the republics own the land, its minerals and other natural resources on their territory. They also own state property, except for that portion which, by treaty, is held by the Union. At the same time gold reserves, oil reserves and diamonds are state property and are managed by the state. So, that is the question. To what extent is one provision in the treaty on the Union of sovereign rpeublics compatible with another?

[Silayev] When I said that the draft law, the draft treaty, had serious shortcomings, I had this article, this question, particularly in mind. It really is not clear. It requries serious revision. But, at all events, if we are saying that minerals belong to the people, and to those organs of power which have been elected in a given territory, we cannot have a situation in which something does belong and something else does not belong. Obviously, one cannot differentiate among oil, gas, coal, timber and other natural resources. Gold, in particular, is a different question. But, as far as the rest are concerned, I consider that the position should be clearly spelled out. The specific territories or regions in which oil is recovered should also derive definite economic advantages, in the form of taxation on every tonne of extracted oil or every cubic meter of timber. The extraction organizations involved should have obligations to invest in local structures, especially in the social sphere. But, at the end of the day, there should not be any duality here. This is basically the property of the republics.

What about gold or diamonds? Here, without violating the principle of territorial ownership, all the Union republics could reach a special agreement on how to handle this delicate question. Naturally, this is a strategic commodity. It is a very profitable commodity, which earns a lot of foreign exchange. But certainly this is not a matter—when, for instance, 230 tonnes of gold are marketed, even when the proceeds are to be spent on logical, essential needs—the authorities in the territories from which the gold is exported know nothing about this, and this is not right.

Therefore, a special agreement can and must be reached between the republics and the center on this delicate type of natural resource.

[Correspondent] Between Russia and the center, let us say, because gold and diamonds are the prerogative of Russia.

[Silayev] No, why? Not only Russia. There is also Kazakhstan involved.

[Correspondent] The country's main reserves are, of course, in Russia.

[Silayev] Yes, the main ones are in Russia, of course.

[Correspondent] Nadezhda Nikolayevna Korotkova asks what the priority tasks of executive committees at town and rayon level are, as far as the economic reform is concerned, in particular in privatization and denationalization. There are no laws on these questions. This is a very interesting question. Indeed, here we are, talking about privatization when the actual laws which will regulate this do not exist.

[Silayev] The priority tasks of executive committees at any level of executive power are to gear the economy to the needs of the people, to the needs of the family. After all, we have wasted too much time and energy trying to create a comprehensive system for the manufacture of the means of production. That is a general observation, let us say. The important thing is to work in the interests of the consumer market.

As far as privatization and denationalization are concerned, I would ask local authorities not to attempt the privatization of major enterprises and associations. The main thing that we need at the moment is to transfer ownership to small collectives and individual citizens. This applies to everything that provides direct services to the population, including shops, bakeries, breadshops, tailoring establishments, repair workshops, and small enterprises for the production of consumer goods, light industry goods, textile goods, and shoes. In these areas serious work must be done to evaluate the value of basic assets and to resolve these questions more boldly. Naturally, there must be legislation. Here one can [changes thought] we know that rash decisions are already being taken in this respect. This is why we appealed to our Supreme Soviet not to postpone the adoption of the law on privatization, and I think that we will help the local power bodies with the necessary laws during the near future and with practical recommendations.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, in general the law is fair...on the one hand...the question is fair, we really are speaking about privatization, but the mechanism of how this is to occur does not yet exist and evidently there is a fear that people will destroy things. A question from Vera Fedorovna from Moscow: I am happy to be able to convey to you that Russians believe in you and wish you health, and courage, and that God will help you. How will your work help the introduction of the post of president of Russia, how will the introduction of the post of president of Russia help your work, and will the introduction of the post of president of Russia enhance the prestige of Russia, and in which cases?

[Silayev] I thank you, Vera Fedorovna. I would like to say this. I do not understand why some citizens perceive so painfully the raising of the issue of presidency in Russia, especially against the background of the fact that there already are presidential forms of administration, not only in the Union as a whole but also in Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, and Moldova. Why should such a republic as the Russian Federation not have the same structure of state administration? For against the background of a general decline in discipline, of excessive freedom of power, let us say, and of insubordination following on from this, the presidential form is, generally speaking, a step that allows state affairs to be conducted in a more organized manner, and this includes the Russian Federation. I consider that the presidential form in Russia would not only be useful but would also be necessary. The fact that, it should be stated frankly, let us say in Kazakhstan or in Uzbekistan, the presidential form is already producing appropriate results and under these conditions the executive bodies of power are also working more easily and exchanging opinions with their colleagues, it really is like this. It is another matter that there will already, obviously, be other structures there, directly born of an executive power body. Therefore this will be like a derivative from the adoption of the issue of whether there should or should not be a presidency. I am in favor of presidency in the Russian Federation.

[Correspondent] Mendeleyeva from Moscow: All contract prices are being blamed on the Moscow City Soviet and the RSFSR Council of Ministers—if this is not the case, convince us.

[Silayev] I thank you for such a question, and I have felt the need to make a comment on a recent reproach directed in particular toward the Russian Federation. These are issues relating to the prices on agricultural products, on food tax and state procurement. Yes, it really is the case that our purchase prices for foodstuffs are set in accordance with food tax, and not only in accordance with contract prices. These are different. Otherwise there is no sense in it—what are contract prices? These are imposed prices. Therefore we have tried to make it advantageous for the peasants. It is advantageous to sell to the state products in accordance with state procurement, having set production in accordance with food tax. But I categorically do not agree with the assertion that this will lead to an increase in prices. We have not changed the retail prices on basic foodstuffs, so they may be changed in an organized fashion, but they will be fully compensated. The other question, that there is a higher price on output for state procurement, for procurement prices, these are at the expense of the Russian budget. Our internal question in no way affects changes, even less of retail prices. This is not necessary at all.

[Correspondent] Thank you. Aleksandr Simenovich Chubov from [word indistinct]. You say that there will be compensation for prices, in your words. But who specifically will be paid compensation? I would combine this question with a question from Konstantin Andreyevich Pogorelov from Novosibirsk: What aim is the government pursuing in raising prices and simultaneously paying us compensation? Well, in actual fact, perhaps it is not worth paying compensation, just raising...in general the correlation, is compensation advantageous?

[Silayev] I understand you, yes. Well, who specifically? In relation to foodstuffs, all strata of the population. I have already spoken about this and am repeating it again, and the implementation of this will begin during the next few days. In relation to the children's range, all families which have children, and so on. It is paid where salaries, stipends or pensions are received. Well, the aim is an economic aim. Purchase prices have been increased very drastically, wholesale prices have been increased, and they reflect economic necessity.

Against this background it is quite simply unprofitable for manufacturers to supply goods to trading organizations at the previous prices. One set of prices must be brought into conformity with another set. This is an economic inevitability and our task is, quite simply, to ensure that as little harm as possible is caused by this, to ensure that our citizens can satisfy their requirements in a reasonable way once prices have been restructured.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, in one of his interviews Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov, prime minister of the Union, said that compensation would be given for 85 percent of the increase. In other words, as a result of the price increases and the compensation, the budget would receive 15 percent, as it were. This applies to the Union. What will happen in Russia? Have you calculated how much it will be? If so...

[Silayev, interrupting] Of course we have done our sums. You have to ask yourself where the money from the price increases and, consequently, the increased revenue that you would expect to result, will go. What will happen is that 80 percent of this additional revenue will be spent on the payment of compensation to citizens for their increased expenditure. Originally, I remind you, the idea was that 60 percent would be spent on compensation for the population and 40 percent would be spent on tackling other state questions. Subsequently, as Comrade Pavlov said, it was decided that no less than 80 percent should be spent on compensation. We support this. Furthermore, certain budgetary levels were built into the budgets to provide compensation in areas where even the 80 percent is not enough.

On the whole—I repeat yet again—this will be clearer to everyone in the very near future—the task is being set, and corresponding budgetary arrangements are being made, for full compensation for food and differentiated compensation for other goods, i.e. taking account of affluence, average wages or, quite simply, family income. This is what will determine whether compensation is complete or partial.

[Correspondent] Here is another quote from Pavlov. In February, Pavlov, our prime minister, said that prices of

medical items would remain the same. But in Kazakhstan they have been increased by 200 percent. What is the situation in the RSFSR? That is a question from Merebek Ismailov from Chimkent.

[Silayev] We are not increasing prices on medical items.

[Correspondent] Not at all?

[Silayev] We are not increasing them, no.

[Correspondent] Here is a question from Valentin Ivanovich Balchenko in Samara. What documents are there on small enterprises? Why are they being equated with cooperatives? Is this right?

[Silayev] Well, actually, a very wide variety of small-scale enterprises can exist. They can be enterprises owned entirely by the state, but small ones nevertheless. Admittedly, we have not gotten used to this idea. We tend to think that an enterprise means an organization with 20,000-30,000 employees. Nevertheless, the relative importance of small-scale enterprises, ones with 50, 100 or, at the most, 150 employees, is great in today's world. In our country you would have to look very hard for evidence of this. But the forms of ownership applicable to small-scale enterprises can vary. They can be entirely state-owned, mixed, or privately owned. We, in our republic, in our program, support small-scale enterprises. We have already made plans for financial support. The laws on privatization and denationalization define what small-scale enterprises are and make provisions for appropriate economic support for the development of these small-scale enterprises.

[Correspondent] Vladimir Gavriilovich Tsarev from Moscow writes: Do enterprises in the city of Moscow belong to Russia or to the Union? To whom will pension contributions be paid—to the Russian fund or the Union fund? Well, if you work at a Union-owned enterprise, I assume your pension contributions will be paid to...

[Silayev, interrupting] Well, first and foremost, I would not use expressions like Russian ownership or non-Russian ownership. The point is that enterprises must be economically independent. The sooner this is done, the greter the scale on which this is done, the better our economy will develop. In the capital there are very many enterprises of all types, including republican status enterprises, for instance light industry and textile enterprises. They have all been handed over to the republics. At the same time, there are big enterprises in Moscow like the Likhachev plant, for instance, the Lenin Komsomol motor plant, and others. These are enterprises which, at the moment, are under Union ownership. Our view is that enterprises should follow the path of privatisation, but they should do this in a collectivist way. For instance, joint-stock companies can be set up. This is the direct path, let us say, to economic improvement. Everyone has a direct stake in the results of his work. Therefore, I would not want to initiate a debate over this. I repeat, the sooner enterprises start gaining their independence, the better it will be. The Russian Government guarantees them economic support. We are not intending to administer them. As far as pensions are concerned, we intend that citizens living on Russian territory should be guided by the law on pensions adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

[Correspondent] Lidiya Alekseyevna Telekhoda from Moscow. Your attitude towards demonstrations and rallies—do you consider that these will facilitate the resolution of economic problems?

[Silayev] Well, we obviously must not altogether renounce such an expression of our views and our positions in the form of political actions such as demonstrations and rallies. But if these inflict damage on the eocnomy, if they not only do harm but also let us say overturn efforts, including those of the Russian Government, then this of course is not a way of resolving economic tasks. Incidentally, this is all quite regulated abroad. Rallies are not organized during working hours, and in general all of this is done outside the framework of labor processes. Any political expressions of will, as they say. Order in the economy and order at enterprises, from the point of view of discipline and the maximum efficiency of activity for each enterprises and each worker, should be the law.

[Correspondent] Comrade Kosonozhkin, Rostov Oblast. Why is the government not taking any measures on talks with the miners? After all, there is a two-fold increase for salaries for coal workers in the Union budget.

[Silayev] I understand that Comrade Kosonozhkin is addressing the Russian Government.

[Correspondent] Probably.

[Silayev] He did not say which. Well, I, this situation which is taking shape on our territory worries us. We, I personnally am planning ... in a few days I will be in Novosibirsk, and in Novosibirsk we will be working with agrarian workers, I said that it would be the 13th-15th, and we will also go to Kemerovo and will meet miners there to discuss the basic economic problems that worry them. I promise this.

[Correspondent] Nikolay Alekseyevich Kugov, Sosnavskoye, Gorki Oblast, an invalid from the great patriotic war. How can one manage to be received by Ivan Stepanovich Silayev personally?

[Silayev] You did not read this from the very beginning, to shorten it: When will invalids and participants in the great patriotic war be provided with cars? Why do local and party leaders switch from car to car while war invalids are supposed to wait in a queue for 113 years? How can one manage to be received by Ivan Stepanovich Silayev personally? I invite you, Nikolay Aleksyevich, and will give all the appropriate instructions so that a meeting between us can take place at the very least during the next seven to 10 days.

[Correspondent] Ivan Stepanovich, what sum is Russia planning to allocate for the payment to parents who have remained at home with their children—70 rubles a month? This question is asked by Sergey Konstantinovich Tarasin from Moscow.

[Silayev] I would ask you, respected Sergey Konstantinovich, to wait two or three days until all of this is published, and it seems to me that we have planned sufficiently convincing support for families when parents, and first and foremost, obviously, the mother, have to leave work and stay at home with the children. This has all been foreseen, including the extent and scale, and it will be published in the next few days.

[Correspondent] Nikolay Leonovich Chernyshev from Moscow. I heard on Russia's radio that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has said that a program is being prepared for 15 March on the way out of the economic crisis. I would like to know the details relating to this program.

[Silayev] I understand that we have only a little more than a minute remaining. Yes, we really have been entrusted by a decision of the Russian Supreme Soviet with preparing such a program, a working program, a specific program. We are now working on it and on the eve of the congress, the extraordinary congress, we will publish it.

[Interview] Well, thank you for considering it possible to come to our studio and for answering. I would say the greater part of the questions. We have been able to answer many questions today. Once again thank you, and I wish you success.

[Silayev] I thank you for the opportunity given to me. Goodbye.

Polozkov Visits Arctic Military, Working Class

Interviewed by Northern Newspaper

PM1803133191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "I.K. Polozkov in Arctic"]

[Text] Murmansk—I.K. Polozkov, the leader of the Russian Communists, arrived in Murmansk yesterday evening. Immediately there was a meeting with members of the bureau and aktiv of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party obkom [oblast committee].

He will be on the Kola Peninsula during the days preceding the all-Union referendum. There will be meetings with military seamen, workers of a number of enterprises, and rural workers.

"There are no secret plans concealed behind my trip," states an interview with Polozkov published in today's POLYARNAYA GAZETA. "I was sincerely glad when I received from the chief of the Northern Fleet military-political directorate an invitation to take part in the party conference. Especially as I have a special attitude toward seamen: I did my military service in the Navy."

In I.K. Polozkov's interview it is also reported that he intends to use the meetings with the military and representatives of the working class of the Arctic to explain the position of the RSFSR Communist Party leadership at the present stage of perestroyka and its attitude toward the forthcoming referendum.

Addresses Northern Fleet Communists

PM1803123591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent A. Minayev: "Meeting With Northern Fleet Sailors"]

[Text] Murmansk Oblast—The participants in a 14 March party conference of the Red Banner Northern Fleet said a resolute "no" to the pseudodemocrats' attempts to divide the Army along national lines. I.K. Polozkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the work of the conference and addressed it.

The fleet's Communists are united in believing that, on the path of the renewal of our society and of the CPSU, resolute actions are needed to consolidate the party organs and legality and to introduce order. They support the political statement of the joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and CPSU Central Control Commission "on the current moment and the party's tasks" and resolutely oppose the depoliticization and departyization of the Armed Forces.

The conference deemed it necessary to state the need to elaborate on a new CPSU Program and admitted that the paramount task of the current moment for all party organizations is the extensive explanation of the fact that we all have the one motherland—the USSR—and it is with this feeling that we should go to the 17 March nationwide referendum.

Meets Murmansk Labor Collectives

PM1803114991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent A. Minayev under the "Official" rubric: "Meetings at Enterprises"]

[Text] Murmansk Oblast—The basic workshops at "Severonikel," the USSR's largest production association, greeted in sad silence N.I. Polozkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, who is touring Murmansk Oblast. This industrial giant has now been standing idle for a whole week due to nondelivery of raw materials from various regions of the country, failing

every day to supply particularly important output worth several million rubles. Output for which metallurgical workers in Cherepovets, Magnitogorsk, Chelyabinsk, and the Ukraine and many other sectors are waiting. That is why a very trenchant discussion took place in the electrolysis production unit's assembly hall, where I.K. Polozkov met with workers, foremen, specialists, and enterprise leaders.

The leader of the Russian Communist Party answered a host of difficult, trenchant questions. His talk with labor collectives at the Murmansk Fishing Combine and the oblast's party economic aktiv was equally complex.

Gidaspov at Leningrad Military Party Conference

PM1803110591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Shcherbakov under the "Official" rubric: "Stepping Up Work"]

[Text] Leningrad, 15 Mar—The 35th Leningrad Military District party conference was held here today, completing the process of reforming the structure of CPSU organizations within troop collectives.

The conference formed a party committee and control commission for the district's party organizations, elected delegates to the all-Army party conference, and nominated candidate members of the all-Army party committee.

B.V. Gidaspov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and first secretary of Leningrad CPSU Obkom [Oblast Party Committee], took part in the conference's work.

IZVESTIYA Correction on Treaty Signatories

PM1803164391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Union Edition p 8

[Unattributed "Correction"]

[Text] For technical reasons the name of the representative of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] was omitted from the list of the republics' representatives who signed the protocol to the draft Treaty on the Union of Sovereign Republics in the item "Who Signed the Treaty" (IZVESTIYA No. 61). It should have read:

"RSFSR:
"R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet;
"V.B. Isakov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the Republic;
"R.G. Abdulatipov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities."

From the editors: This is already the second correction since the publication of the list of those who signed the protocol to the draft treaty. Naturally, the question which could not fail to arise in the editorial office was: What kind of "technical reasons" were they? This is what we were told in this regard at the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat:

"Comrade A.Ch. Charyyev had flown back home to Ashkhabad a couple of days before the republics' representatives began signing the protocol, and he sent a copy with his signature when the document had already been duplicated and distributed to members of the Federation Council.

"As regards Comrade R.I. Khasbulatov, he signed his copy of the protocol during the actual work of the Federation Council. Therefore there was not time to include his signature either in all the copies of the draft document. We beg IZVESTIYA's readers to accept our apologies for such an inaccuracy and to take account of the published correction."

Western Republics

Alleged Moldovan Human Rights Abuses Noted

91UN1086A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Appeal by group of deputies of the Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet]

[Text] Dear Comrades,

In the fall of 1990, the leaders of our republics signed and the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet ratified the Treaty on the Principles of Interstate Relations of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet] and the Moldovan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet deferred ratification until it obtained assurances of the observance of human rights in the Moldovan SSR.

Article 6 of the treaty says the "high contracting parties mutually undertake to guarantee persons residing on the territory of the parties the right to retain or acquire citizenship of the RSFSR or the Moldovan SSR in accordance with their freely expressed wishes." In accordance with Article 7, "each...party guarantees citizens of the other...party residing on its territory...social, economic, and cultural rights and also civil rights and rights and liberties in accordance with the generally recognized international human rights provisions." The treaty does not provide for the possibility of acquisition of dual citizenship.

In this connection we deem it essential to call your attention to the fact that the legislative activity of the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet has, even following ratification of the treaty, been leading in practice, as before, to a violation of human rights and the rights of the national minorities. Thus the "Property Act" adopted by the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet accords

only citizens of the Moldovan SSR the right to land ownership. Thus even non-Moldovan rural inhabitants who have spent their whole life in Moldova (and there are many Ukrainian, Russian, Gagauz and Bulgarian villages in Moldova) will in fact be deprived of the right of free choice of citizenship. Such a change will be enshrined in the Constitution any day now. Such importance is attached to the Citizenship Act, which has now passed in its first reading, that the decree on the introduction of the Property Act links the date of its entry into force with the adoption of the Citizenship Act. The Migration Act, which has already been adopted, practically prohibits the entry for residence into Moldova of representatives of other nationalities, for family reunification included. There is every reason to believe that the enactment of other laws also will limit the rights of the citizens of other Union republics and stateless persons and also citizens of the USSR permanently resident in the Moldovan SSR. A campaign is being conducted simultaneously in the press, legislative included, for authorization for the acquisition of dual Moldovan-Romanian citizenship, which many thousands of Romanian citizens are already claiming.

The current situation testifies that ratification of the treaty in the form in which it has been signed will not lead to guaranteed rights of the national minorities, including Russians, in the Moldovan SSR.

We request, in accordance with Article 18 of the treaty, prior to ratification, that the right to dual RSFSR-Moldovan SSR citizenship, regardless of possession of citizenship of the USSR or not, be inserted in the treaty and that such citizens be accorded equal rights with persons who have the citizenship of one of the republics on its territory. We ask simultaneously that our propositions be taken into consideration at the time of elaboration of the RSFSR Citizenship Act (the right to citizenship of the RSFSR not being confined merely to the persons whose immediate relatives or they themselves have been resident on the territory of the RSFSR).

[Signed] Deputies of the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet A.M. Safonov and L.V. Pokatilova, 44 signatures altogether.

Ukraine's Fokin Elected People's Deputy

LD1803145591 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 18 Mar 91

[By UKRINFOMR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev March 18 TASS—It was learned here today that Chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers Vitold Fokin has been elected people's deputy of the Ukraine from the Darnitsa constituency of Kiev on March 17. The vacancy was contested by five candidates. Fokin won more than 64 per cent of the votes.

This constituency had no representative in the Ukrainian parliament for quite a time, because its delegate, former First Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and Chairman of the Republican Council of Ministers Vladimir Ivashko was elected Assistant General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and had to resign and leave for Moscow.

The voters liked Fokin's election programme for his firm support to the republic's sovereignty and intention to secure political and economic stability in keeping with the declaration on the Ukraine's state sovereignty.

Fokin believes it can be ensured through the consolidation of the socio-political forces ready to work for the Ukraine's revival, through the formation of an efficient system of social protection. In his opinion, a war should be declared on crime, corruption, shadow economy and black-marketeering. Fokin also favours the adoption by the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet of a law on the status of Kiev as the republic's capital.

Ukrainian-Slovak Cooperation Agreement Signed

LD1603220691 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] A communique between two governments was signed in Kiev today by Vitold Fokin and Vladimir Meciar, prime ministers of the Ukraine and the Slovak Republic. The document envisages the deepening of traditional business cooperation between the two republics. Priority will be given to integration in scientific and technical contacts and broad utilization of mutual experience in solving important economic problems.

Caucasus

Georgian Supreme Soviet Reorganizes State Bodies

LD1803210291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Georgian Supreme Soviet has reorganized the bodies of supreme executive authority in the Republic. The Council of Ministers has received a new official title—the Government of the Republic of Georgia [Pravitelstvo Respubliki Gruzii]. The number of ministeries and departments has been reduced by amalgamating them or abolishing state committees. Departments and various concerns have also been formed.

Manayenkov Meets With Georgian Communists

PM1803120391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the "Official" rubric: "Stay in Georgia"]

[Text] Yu.A. Manayenkov, CPSU Central Committee secretary, has been in Georgia. He had a meeting at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee with the

republic's party aktiv. During the meeting, there was an intense discussion about consolidating the Communist Party's forces, stepping up its vanguard role, and strengthening its ties with the masses. The CPSU Central Committee secretary took part in the work of the Transcaucasus Military District Communists' party conference.

Georgian Protest to North Ossetian Leader Cited

PM1803161991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Second Edition p6

[SAKINFORM report under the general heading "South Ossetia: Shots Ringing Out"]

[Text] The Georgian Supreme Soviet has protested to A.Kh. Galazov, chairman of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, and the USSR central mass media in connection with the stand they have taken on the events in South Ossetia.

The statement says that by falsifying facts, they are misinforming the international and Soviet public and preparing the ground for the introduction of a state of emergency throughout the region. They are thereby pursuing the aim of breaking up Georgia's territorial integrity.

The document stresses that the Georgian Supreme Soviet reserves the right to take measures to stop this provocative activity.

Interview With Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Reprinted

PM1903061991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 91 Second Edition p 6

[Reprint of IL MESSAGGERO interview with Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet; first two paragraphs are introduction; under the "Ours on Us" rubric and the general heading: "Opinion for Export"]

[Text] Italy's IL MESSAGGERO has published an interview with Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet.

Tbilisi—Zviad Gamsakhurdia runs Georgia today. He sits in the depths of a large room and never gets up, raising a hand in greeting. Armed people wearing field uniforms and black leather jackets pace around the doors of his office among the rugs, columns, and candelabra.

[IL MESSAGGERO] What is happening in South Ossetia?

[Gamsakhurdia] Everything starts in Moscow. It is Moscow that is fueling the conflict over this region with its agents and terrorists. In practice it is a case of Kremlin aggression against the 5 million Georgians that make up our nation. Punishment for announcing our desire for independence. Thousands of Georgians have fled this area.

[IL MESSAGGERO] But you have deprived Tskhinvali and a number of villages of water and electricity and have blocked the roads despite the fact that it is winter now. Armed detachments are driving away livestock. This is, after all, war on the peaceful population.

[Gamsakhurdia] It is war and that is why we are reacting as one should in wartime. But it is Moscow, not us, that is committing the crime in manipulating the Ossetian population. If there is no electricity in Tskhinvali, that does not depend on us, it is the decision of Georgian working people's trade unions.

[IL MESSAGGERO] You speak of cultural traditions. How can you explain the devastation that armed Georgian detachments inflicted on Tskhinvali city's theater where they camped for three weeks?

[Gamsakhurdia] They were bandits from North Ossetia and not Georgian forces. They came there with Moscow's help.

[IL MESSAGGERO] However, these people shot at the municipal population and wore Georgian militia uniforms.

[Gamsakhurdia] I repeat that they are bandits form the North.

[IL MESSAGGERO] Deputy Torez Kulumbegov, the leader of the Ossetians' movement, is in jail. Why has no one been allowed to see him?

[Gamsakhurdia] Kulumbegov is the leader of the Ossetian terrorists and not a political oppositionist. No one can see him because the investigation into his case is already under way.

[IL MESSAGGERO] In the past you were a member of the "Helsinki Group" that defends human rights. How can you have the heart to fight the peaceful population today?

[Gamsakhurdia] I am still a member of the "Helsinki Group," but it was Moscow that created the current situation. I have nothing to reproach myself for with regard to the question of human rights violations in Georgia now.

Turkish President Ozal Visits Baku 15-16 Mar

Welcomed on Arrival

NC1803085191 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Excerpts] President Turgut Ozal, who is visiting the Soviet Union at the head of a Turkish delegation, arrived in Baku today. President Ayaz Mutalibov and El'mira Kafarova, chairwoman of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, Gasan Gasanov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers, and others welcomed President

Ozal. Altin Karamanoglu, Turkey's consul in Baku, was among the dignitaries who welcomed President Ozal. [Passage omitted]

President Turgut Ozal's official visit to Azerbaijan is welcomed in the republic. The Azerbaijani people express hope that the talks between the Soviet Union and Turkey will broaden the bilateral cooperation between the two sides in the political, economic, and other fields and contribute toward efforts to strengthen peace and stability in the Near East and the Middle East regions.

Mutalibov, Gasanov on Ties

TA1603160491 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1535 GMT 16 Mar 91

[Text] Baku (A.A)—Following the visit by President Turgut Ozal to Azerbaijan since Friday, both sides expressed hope for closer relations between Turkey and the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan, A.A. [Ankara ANATOLIA] correspondent accompanying Ozal reported today.

Azerbaijan head of state Ayaz Mutalibov told A.A. that closer relations were a necessity for Azerbaijan. "We are neighbors and brothers," he said.

Azerbaijan Prime Minister Gasan Gasanov also spoke to A.A. and said Azerbaijan was always interested in the developments in Turkey but establishment of relations between their countries became possible only after "perestroyka" in the Soviet Union.

Gasanov added Azerbaijan will present to Turkey on Saturday a package of proposals containing 25 projects. He also pointed that they intended to build a business center and hotel for Turkish businessmen to visit Azerbaijan.

Meanwhile, Turkish Airlines (THY) sent its first flight to Baku today. Regular flights between Istanbul and Baku will commence on March 25. At the same time three cargo planes from Turkish Air Force brought 40 tonnes of medicines to Azerbaijan this morning.

Turkey's first consul general in Baku, Altan Kamanoglu, a former consul in Lyon in France, started work in Baku today.

President Turgut Ozal himself pledged here on Friday evening that Turkey will never withdraw its support from Azerbaijan at a dinner given in his honor by Mutalibov.

He added that presence of Armenia in the region will not hinder development of economic relations between Turkey and Azerbaijan, because, "given time, economic interests will remove the effects of political disputes."

President Turgut Ozal's official visit to the Soviet Union began on Monday. Azerbaijan is the fourth and last leg of his visit in that country.

Talks Conclude, Documents Signed

TA1603161991 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1540 GMT 16 Mar 91

[Text] Baku (A.A)—Three documents were signed this morning in Baku at the end of official talks between Azerbaijan and Turkey.

President Turgut Ozal, currently in Azerbaijan, the fourth and last leg of his 6-day visit to the Soviet Union, started his contacts on Saturday by a bilateral meeting with Azerbaijani head of state Ayaz Mutalibov.

Then he joined the official talks to sign a document to confirm agreements reached between the two countries.

According to this document, both sides promised to do their utmost for the realization of a proposal package containing 25 projects submitted by the Azerbaijani side.

On the other hand Turkey will commence studies relevant to the credit Azerbaijan asked.

Meanwhile, Soviet Ambassador to Ankara, Albert Chernyshev, said to A.A. that President Turgut Ozal's 6-day official visit to the Soviet Union has been a perfect occasion for stepping up relations between the two countries.

He added that all his dreams before the visit had now been realized.

Received by Mutalibov, Departs

LD1603191791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 16 Mar 91

[Report by Azerinform-TASS correspondents Natan Barskiy and Khalik Imanov]

[Excerpts] Baku, 16 mar (TASS)—Turgut Ozal, president of the Republic of Turkey, who is currently on an official visit in the Soviet Union at the invitation of USSR Pesident Mikhail Gorbachev, today met with Ayaz Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijan Republic.

Relations between Turkey and Azerbaijan are developing successfully, and our Republic, which is embarking upon the path of a market economy very much needs and will find useful the experience of neighboring countries such as Turkey, the leader of the Azerbaijan republic noted. The Turkish president in turn assured that his country will render necessary aid to Azerbaijan in the most diverse spheres and is prepared to promote the creation of small- and medium-size joint enterprises and personnel training. Anticipating tomorrow's referendum in the USSR, the lofty guest especially stressed that the integrity of the USSR and successful completion of the changes that have started in the USSR determine in many respects the future of the peoples of the whole world. [passage omitted]

During Turgut Ozal's stay in Baku, agreements on expanding and deepening political, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation between the Republic of Turkey and the Azerbaijan Republic and on developing tourism and direct transport links between Turkey and Azerbaijan, which have a common border, were signed.

Today the president of the Republic of Turkey left for home. He was seen off at the airport by Ayaz Mutalibov, president of the Azerbiajan Republic, and other officials.

Turkish Military Plane Brings Medicine to Baku

NC1803090991 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] Three C-130 Hercules aircraft of the Turkish Air Force arrived in Baku on a peace mission on 15 March. The aircraft brought humanitarian aid from Ankara to the Azerbaijani doctors. Hasan Celikbilek, the commander of one of the three aircraft, informed an Azerinform correspondent that the flight, which took more than three and a half hours, was successfully completed. He also thanked the Soviet aviation [word indistinct], who helped the aircraft to fly to Baku.

The aircraft delivered more than 100 [words indistinct] and medical instruments, which weighed 60 tons, to Baku. This was in accordance with the agreement that was signed between the Health Ministries of Turkey and Azerbaijan two weeks ago. The cargo was unloaded from the aircraft within a short period of time. Fahreddin Dzhavadov, deputy minister of health for Azerbaijan, has said: The doctors in Azerbaijan have drawn up plans to improve their cooperation with their Turkish counterparts. Organizing symposiums is included in the agreement that has been signed between the two sides. The first symposium has already been held in Baku. Exchanging experts and establishing joint [word indistinct] is also under consideration.

Azerbaijan Counterintelligence Head on Espionage

PM1803130991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 8

[Correspondent Z. Kadymbekov report: "Trust, But Verify"]

[Text] Baku—Western special services' interest in important industrial and military installations on Azerbaijan's territory is not abating and has increasingly intensified of late. Cunning methods and modern technical resources are being used to procure secret information. F. Abbasov, chief of the republic KGB Counterintelligence Department, said this at a routine press conference for local and central mass media journalists.

Last year alone, 30 people involved in foreign special service activity were discovered among foreigners visiting us. During their stay in Azerbaijan, in order to perform missions for intelligence and other subversive centers, some guests commit illegal acts such as violations of regulations governing photography, travel and residence on USSR territory, and entry into the border zone, and they use false documents. Since September 1989, 44 foreign citizens have been recorded as committing violations of this kind —this figure is many times the analogous indicators for previous years.

The republic's Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] is the subject of particular attention from the visitors. Last year alone, 98 foreigners illegally visiting the NKAO and engaging in illegal antisocial activity were detected and expelled.

What do these facts indicate? Some intelligence centers abroad have decided to take advantage, in their own way, of the relaxation of international tension and Soviet people's amicable attitude toward foreigners and representatives of business circles and of our hospitality and openness. In our view, it is appropriate here to recall the well known rule: "Trust, but verify." Given the increase in subversive activity against Azerbaijan, the republic's KGB will continue to work actively to counter foreign special services' intelligence operations.

Ter-Petrosyan Urges Debate on Ties With Turkey

NC1803092791 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 16 Mar 91

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Yesterday, the people's deputies held a consultative meeting at the Supreme Soviet Presidium in connection with the demand made by a number of people's deputies to convene an extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet to debate the question "On Considering as Illegal the 16 March 1921 Russo-Turkish Treaty's Articles Relating to Armenia."

The consultative meeting was chaired by Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet. He specifically noted that the consultative gathering was occasioned by the current Moscow negotiations in connection with the signing of the Soviet-Turkish treaty. As was the case in the past, these negotiations are being conducted without the participation of the concerned republics.

On behalf of the student sit-in demonstration held in front of the Supreme Soviet Presidium building, Khrayr Karapetyan, the representative of the Political Executive Office of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation Central Committee, presented a draft to be discussed at the extraordinary session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

This and other statements made at the consultative meeting in support of the proposal to consider as illegal the 1921 Russo-Turkish Treaty's articles relating to Armenia failed to furnish the political exigency necessitating the adoption of such a decision.

Summarizing the results of the consultation, Levon Ter-Petrosyan noted that no one was able to reply to the questions concerning the future moves, actions, and security guarantees of Armenia should such a decision be adopted by the Supreme Soviet. Levon Ter-Petrosyan stressed at the same time that it would be appropriate to organize a parliamentary debate on the overall conception of Armenian-Turkish relations to clarify the national policy.

Georgia Armenians Reject Prefect Appointment

NC1803153991 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 17 Mar 91

[Text] A meeting has taken place in Akhalkalak [Georgia] between a delegation representing the local Dzhavakhk Popular Movement, the Parvana public organization in Bogdanovskiy, plenipotentiary representatives of (?enterprises), and leaders of [names indistinct] rayons on the one hand and a delegation from the Georgian Supreme Soviet on the other. [Words indistinct] the Armenians did not agree with the appointment of prefects in view of the fact that the people want their elected representatives to become the prefects. The Armenians also took exception to the law concerning the language to be used in the courts and (?in the administration). The people do not [word indistinct] that law because more than 92 percent of the residents are Armenians and do not speak Georgian.

During the meeting, the policy pursued by Georgia was also raised. It was described as antipopular and antidemocratic [words indistinct].

The next day, representatives of the enterprises and public organizations in Akhalkalakskiy Rayon held a joint meeting and (?decided) to convene a meeting of plenipotentiary representatives who will be empowered to administer the rayon until the establishment of a new democratic administration. It also called for the creation of an (?organizational committee) and a boycott of the local elections to be held on [words indistinct] because the [word indistinct] have been divided in an undemocratic manner.